



PEETERS

THE SOURCES OF THEOPHANES FOR THE HERACLIAN DYNASTY

Author(s): Ann S. Proudfoot

Source: *Byzantion*, 1974, Vol. 44, No. 2 (1974), pp. 367-439

Published by: Peeters Publishers

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44170450>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Peeters Publishers is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Byzantion*

JSTOR

THE SOURCES OF THEOPHANES FOR THE HERACLIAN DYNASTY

The seventh century was a crucial period in the evolution of the Empire of Constantinople and indeed of the whole mediaeval Mediterranean world, and although its major historical issues are considered here only in so far as they are linked with specific aspects of chronicle interpretation*, determination of the nature and identity of the sources upon which Theophanes the Confessor based his narrative of the history of the Heraclian dynasty (610-711) in the *Chronographia* ⁽¹⁾ is therefore significant not only in evaluation of the scholarship and credibility of Theophanes himself, but also in the wider context of Byzantine chronography as a whole. The *Chronographia* is of paramount importance for our knowledge of the Heraclian era, for its influence upon later Byzantine chroniclers and upon western annalists, for the portions of otherwise lost historical sources for the seventh and eighth centuries which it preserved; yet Theophanes was essentially an unoriginal compiler of a very high order who worked from other older primary sources, so that in the absence of abundant comparable literary evidence the accurate assessment of the *Chronographia* which is fundamental can only be based upon knowledge of these contributory sources. Furthermore, since Theophanes apparently utilised all the information available to him for this comparatively ill-documented epoch, it is a reasonable assumption that his sources

(*) The foundations of this paper were laid under the inspiration, guidance, and criticism of Prof. Cyril Mango, and its present form owes much to Dr. Antony Bryer, Prof. Donald Nicol, and Dr. Vladimír Vavřínek; while Dr. Sebastian Brock indicated the importance and the value of study of those appropriate Syriac texts published since E. W. Brooks' pioneer work in this field, and Dr. D. Justin Schowe provided much general information upon and many specific criticisms of the chroniclers' recordings of natural phenomena; but none of these scholars is to be regarded as responsible for this paper's inadequacies, nor as necessarily endorsing its conclusions.

(1) *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, II vols., Leipzig, 1883.

represent the sum total of historical sources for the seventh century, and thus provide a valid indication of the general state of Byzantine literature from the seventh to the ninth centuries. Among the ancestry of the traditions which converge upon the *Chronographia* to resemble a reversed stemma, the relatively easy objective identification of extant sources contrasts with the necessarily but regrettably subjective isolation of wholly or partially lost sources carrying within themselves earlier traditions; while in addition to these hazards attendant upon the very nature of Byzantine chroniclers where so many of their incorporated traditions are not known independently, the attempted detection of the sources of individual incidents detached from the framework of the *Chronographia* as a whole tends towards an improbable proliferation of problematical original sources. The rôle of chronicle tradition in historical science can be put into perspective by delineation of the interdependence and complex relationships as well as the wide variety and differing value of the literary and diplomatic and archaeological sources from which the scholar derives knowledge in Byzantine studies, but although none of the hypotheses set out below is in witting conflict with the testimony of history's ancillary disciplines or heuristic, the limitation of the present debate to the genre of evidence used by Theophanes himself thereby excludes from citation material such as that assembled in Dölger's vital register and critical annotation of all imperial documents whether actually extant or known only from allusions in other sources ⁽¹⁾. Comparatively little of the considerable range of secondary work in the field of Byzantine chronography has been devoted to the problem now under consideration, and the studies cited below represent only a part of this; detailed information can be found in Moravcsik's ⁽²⁾ fitting successor to Krumbacher's ⁽³⁾ masterpiece, as well as the fifth volume of the extensive work of Bardenhewer ⁽⁴⁾

(1) F. DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches I 565-1025* (in *Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuern Zeit*, Reihe A, Abt. I), München, 1924.

(2) G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, II vols., Berlin, 1958.

(3) K. KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, München, 1897.

(4) O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, V vols., Freiburg, 1912-1932.

and the handbook of Beck ⁽¹⁾ and the briefer survey of Colonna ⁽²⁾, all of which may be supplemented by the classified inventories of works anent Byzantine history and civilisation published from their inception in 1892 and 1929 respectively in the periodicals *Byzantische Zeitschrift* and *Byzantinoslavica*; the encyclopedic and bibliographic contribution of the above standard reference texts to the present paper is too obvious to require comment.

Theophanes is our principal but not our sole source, so that it is necessary to study not only the other Byzantine chroniclers of the eighth and ninth centuries, the patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople ⁽³⁾ and George Hamartolus the Monk ⁽⁴⁾, to determine their relationship to Theophanes and to his sources before attempting to delineate these sources more fully by contrast with those underlying tenth and eleventh century chroniclers such as Leo Grammaticus ⁽⁵⁾ and George Cedrenus ⁽⁶⁾, but also the extant Byzantine historical sources of the seventh century; for the reign of Phocas (an extension of the field which illuminates considerably the nature and scope of seventh century historiography and its availability in the ninth century) the histories of Theophylact Simocatta ⁽⁷⁾ and John of Antioch ⁽⁸⁾, for the reign of Heraclius the anonymous *Chronicon Paschale* ⁽⁹⁾ augmented by the six historical poems of George of Pisidia ⁽¹⁰⁾ as well as the composite *Analecta*

(1) H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, München, 1959.

(2) M. E. COLONNA, *Gli Storici bizantini dal IV al XV secolo, I Storici profani*, Naples, 1956.

(3) *Nicephori Patriarchae Opuscula Historica*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig, 1880. P. J. ALEXANDER, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Oxford, 1958.

(4) *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig, 1904.

(5) *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn, 1842.

(6) *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, ed. I. BEKKER, II vols., Bonn, 1838-9.

(7) *Theophylact Simocatta Historiae*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig, 1887.

(8) *Ioannis Antiochei Historia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, in *Excerpta de insidiis*, Berlin 1905, pp. 58-150.

(9) *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1832.

(10) *Georgios Pisides, Poemi: I Panegyrici Epici*, ed. A. Pertusi, Ettal, 1959.

Avarica ⁽¹⁾ and the narrative of Antiochus Strategus ⁽²⁾, continuing into the reign of Constans II the connected histories of Monotheletism contained in the *Vita* of Maximus the Confessor ⁽³⁾ and the later *Vita* of Pope Martin I ⁽⁴⁾, to determine their relationship to the later works. The multiracial nature of the early Byzantine Empire which made Greek Byzantine chronicles the pattern of Syrian, Ethiopian, Arab, Armenian, Slav histories, and the model for Roman and German mediaeval historiography, in consequence allowed sources in these languages to be used in compensation for the paucity of Byzantine testimony. Greatest in number and significance for the history of the Heraclians were the Syriac sources considered (in chronological order of composition), the *Chronicon Maroniticum* ⁽⁵⁾ and *Chronicon anonymum* ⁽⁶⁾ of the seventh century, James of Edessa ⁽⁷⁾ and the *Chronicon miscellaneum ad 724 pertinens* ⁽⁸⁾ of the eighth century, the theological writings of St John of Damascus ⁽⁹⁾ and Bartholomew of Edessa ⁽¹⁰⁾, the three short chronicles (*Chronicon anonymum ad 813 pertinens* ⁽¹¹⁾, *Chronicon*

(1) *Analecta Avarica*, ed. L. Sternbach (v. Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetności, Wydział filologiczny, ser. II, T. XV (Cracow, 1900), pp. 297-334).

(2) *Antiochus Strategus, Account of the Sack of Jerusalem in A.D. 614*, tr. F. C. Conybeare (v. Engl. Hist. Rev. XXV (1910), pp. 502-517).

(3) *In vitam ac certamen sancti patris nostri ac confessoris Maximi*, ed. J. P. Migne, P.G., XC. R. DEVRESSE, *La Vie de St. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions* (v. Anal. Boll. XLVI (1928), pp. 1-49).

(4) P. PEETERS, *Une Vie grecque du Pape St. Martin I* (v. Anal. Boll. LI (1933), pp. 225-262).

(5) *Chronicon Maroniticum*, ed. E. W. Brooks, tr. J.-B. Chabot, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

(6) *Chronicon anonymum*, ed. and tr. J. Guidi, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

(6) *Chronicon Jacobi Edesseni*, ed. and tr. E. W. Brooks, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

(8) *Chronicon miscellaneum ad 724 pertinens*, ed. E. W. Brooks, tr. J.-B. Chabot, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

(9) *St. John of Damascus, De Haeresibus Liber and Disputatio Christiani et Saraceni*, ed. J. P. Migne, P.G., XCIV.

(10) *Bartholomew of Edessa, Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni and Contra Mahomedem*, ed. J. P. Migne, P.G., CIV.

(11) *Chronicon anonymum ad 813 pertinens*, ed. E. W. Brooks, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

anonymum ad annum Domini 819 pertinens ⁽¹⁾, *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* ⁽²⁾ and the related work of Denis of Tellmahré ⁽³⁾ of the ninth century, the tenth century Agapius of Hierapolis ⁽⁴⁾ and the eleventh century Elias of Nisibis ⁽⁵⁾ and then the three last great historians of the Syrian Jacobite Church, in the twelfth century Michael the Syrian ⁽⁶⁾ and in the thirteenth century the author of the *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* ⁽⁷⁾ and Gregory bar-Hebraeus ⁽⁸⁾, sources which serve either to supplement Theophanes' narrative or to establish that part of his source material which he held in common with the Syriac writers. If Greek writers gave a source to John of Nikiu ⁽⁹⁾ and a model to Sebeos of Palradouni ⁽¹⁰⁾ while Syriac writers stood in somewhat similar relationship to those Arab sources ⁽¹¹⁾ superficially consulted here, and if the Latin translation of the *Chronographia* by the papal bibliothecarius Anastasius ⁽¹²⁾ in the later ninth century not only transmitted Theophanes to the West but also contributed to the Greek Theo-

(1) *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Domini 819 pertinens*, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. XVII, Louvain, 1920-1927.

(2) *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens*, ed. E. W. Brooks, tr. J.-B. Chabot, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. IV, Paris, 1904.

(3) *Dionysius of Tellmahré, Chronicon*, ed. J.-B. Chabot, Paris, 1895.

(4) *Agapius bishop of Hierapolis, Universal History*, ed. and tr. A. A. Vasiliev, P.O., V, VII, VIII, Paris and Freiburg, 1910-1912.

(5) *Elias Nisibenus, Opus Chronologicum*, ed. J.-B. Chabot, tr. E. W. Brooks, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., SS. Syri, ser. III, T. VII, Paris, 1910.

(6) *La Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche jacobite d'Antioche, 1116-1199*, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot, III vols., Paris, 1899-1910.

(7) *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot, Corpus SS. Christ. Orient., ser. III, T. XIV, Louvain, 1937.

(8) *Bar Hebraei Chronicon syriacum*, ed. and tr. P. J. Bruns and G. G. Kirsch, II vols., Leipzig, 1789. *Bar Hebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. and tr. J. B., Abbeloos and Th. J. Lamy, II vols., Louvain, 1872-1877. *Bar Hebraei Chronicon Arabicum* cf.: *The Chronography of Bar Hebraeus*, E. A. W. Budge, II vols., London, 1932.

(9) *Chronique de Jean évêque de Nikiu*, ed. and tr. H. Zotenberg, Paris, 1883.

(10) *Histoire d'Heraclius par l'évêque Sebeos*, tr. F. Macler, Paris, 1904.

(11) E. W. Brooks, *The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-760) from Arabic Sources* (v. Journ. Hell. Stud. XVIII (1898), pp. 182-208).

(12) *Anastasio Historia tripartita*, in *Theophanis Chronographia II*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig, 1883. E. PERELS, *Papst Nikolaus I und Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, Berlin, 1920, pp. 185-241.

phanes by its derivation from a text older than any of the surviving codices, the antecedents of the seventh and eighth century Latin sources considered (the *Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* ⁽¹⁾, the *Liber Pontificalis* ⁽²⁾, the *Lombard History* of Paul the Deacon ⁽³⁾, and the *Chronicle* of Fredegar ⁽⁴⁾), were less immediately ascertainable; but the illustration of the multilingual nature of Byzantium's historical literature emphasised its contribution to the culture of races who shared neither her Greek tongue nor her imperial dominion.

The carefully calculated chronology of the elaborate tables pre-faced to individual notices of the annalistic narrative, in emulation of George Syncellus ⁽⁵⁾ (to whose unfinished world chronicle the *Chronographia* was a continuation [I, p. 3, ll. 9-12, p. 4, ll. 15-24]) rather than in reproduction of a feature of Theophanes' original chronicle-source material ⁽⁶⁾, was perhaps the most outstanding feature of the *Chronographia* and crucial for the otherwise un-illuminated seventh and eighth centuries of Byzantine history, so that it seemed appropriate to begin consideration of Theophanes' history of the seventh century with a brief description of his fundamental contribution to Byzantine chronology, as well as comments upon some of the problems involved and speculation upon Theophanes' possible sources. These tables comprised the world-year of the Alexandrian era (obsolete in the ninth century), the Incarnation year, the regnal year of the Byzantine emperor, of the Persian king (replaced from the third decade of the seventh century by that of the Arab caliph ⁽¹⁾), and of the five oecumenical patriarchs of Constantinople ⁽²⁾, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch

(1) *Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantia-Arabica ad 741* and *Continuatio Isidoriana Hispana ad 754*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *M.G.H.*, Auct. Antiq. XI, Berlin, 1894.

(2) *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, II vols., Paris, 1888.

(3) *Pauli Diaconi Historiae Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *M.G.H.*, SS. rerum Lang. et Ital., Hanover, 1878.

(4) *Fredegarius Scholasticus, Chronicorum Libri Quattuor*, ed. B. Krusch, *M.G.H.*, SS. rerum Merov., II, Hanover, 1888.

(5) *Cf. Georgii Monachi ... Syncelli Chronographia*, ed. G. Dindorf, Bonn 1829.

(6) C. DE BOOR, *op. cit.*, II, p. 464ff.

and Rome (that of the pope appeared only sporadically, and those of the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria ceased to be given after the Persian and Arab conquests (3)) :

(1) Hormisdas' entry upon an eleven (erroneous (1)) year reign (630) [AM 6121, I, p. 329, ll. 15-7] was succeeded by Muhammad's closing a nine year reign (631) [AM 6122, I, p. 332, ll. 25-7], although the subjection of the Persian kingdom to the Arabs was noted later under the appropriate year [AM 6161, I, p. 341, ll. 2-7].

(2) With slight divergencies between Theophanes' calculations of the lengths of the patriarchates of George I (679), Theodore I (bis) (685) and Paul III (688) [AM 6170, 6176, 6179, I, p. 356, l. 9, p. 361, l. 5, p. 364, l. 1] and the list compiled by Grumel (2), although the latter did not note the work of Brooks (3) where many of these discrepancies were explained as the result of scribal errors ; but Brooks' attribution to Paul II of a thirteen year patriarchate from October 641 was rejected by Devreesse (4).

(3) The death of Anastasius of Antioch (609) [AM 6101, I, p. 296, ll. 15-20] ; the conclusion of Sophronius' three year patriarchate at Jerusalem (636) [AM 6127, I, p. 339, ll. 12-3] ; the conclusion of Peter's ten year patriarchate at Alexandria (654) [AM 6145, I, p. 345, l. 6].

There are, however, two periods in which the world years and indiction numbers stated or implied do not correspond, viz : 609/10 (AM 6102) to 713/4 (AM 6206) and 725/6 (AM 6218) to 773/4 (AM 6265), an incongruity which has long been noted by historians. Several attempts have been made to explain it, originally on the assumption that the world year calculation was correct and the indiction wrong ; according to Bury who attributed Theophanes' error to simple miscalculation (5), and to Hubert who endeavoured to prove this by comparison with the dating of papal letters (6), Leo III the Isaurian (717-41) in 726/7 levied double taxation account-

(1) V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie* (= *Traité d'études byzantines I*), Paris, 1956 pp. 376, 380.

(2) V. GRUMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *On the List of the Patriarchs of Constantinople from 638-715* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VI (1897), pp. 33-54).

(4) R. DEVREESE, *op. cit.*

(5) J. B. BURY, *The Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene*, London, 1889, p. 427.

(6) H. HUBERT, *Observations sur la chronologie de Théophane et de quelques lettres des papes (726-774)* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VI (1897), pp. 491-505).

ing for the tenth and eleventh indictions, and Constantine V Copronymus (741-75) in 772/3 remitted an imposition and thus two years counted as one indiction, while Hodgkin postulated a reform in the Constantinople indiction reckoning which produced a discrepancy between the reckonings of Rome and Constantinople ⁽¹⁾. Brooks first rejected this theory ⁽²⁾, then later refuted these arguments by a comparison of the dating of Theophanes 727-75 with that of the textually corresponding if chronologically removed eastern sources of the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian and the anonymous *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens*, claiming that the error lay in the world-year calculation which came from western sources ⁽³⁾. Ostrogorsky ultimately proved that it was the calculation of the world-year which was wrong, and that of the indiction number which was correct, by a detailed study of those dates of Theophanes which could be controlled viz.: the regnal years of the emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, and that in consistent discrepancy the world-year was one year behind the indiction number; while further examination of the *Chronographia* showed that the error arose through the division of the events of 605 and of 726 into two years, and the contraction of the events of 714-5 and 774-5 into one year ⁽⁴⁾; it was for Dölger to confirm the findings of Ostrogorsky ⁽⁵⁾. Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, Theophanes' chronology has been amended in accordance with Ostrogorsky by the addition of one year to the annus mundi in calculation of the annus domini. The further if lesser problem of whether Theophanes regarded the year as commencing on March 25 according to the Alexandrian world-year or on September 1 according to the Byzantine indiction cycle has not been resolved with equal clarity; Grumel attributed the discrepancy between the world-years and indictions

(1) TH. HODGKIN, *The Chronology of Theophanes in the Eighth Century* (v. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XIII (1898), pp. 283-289).

(2) E. W. BROOKS, *Indictions at Rome, 727-775* (v. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XIII (1898), pp. 290-296).

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *The Chronology of Theophanes 605-775* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VIII (1899), pp. 82-97).

(4) G. OSTROGORSKY, *Die Chronologie des Theophanes im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert* (v. *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, VII (1930), pp. 1-56).

(5) F. DÖLGER, *G. Ostrogorsky: Die Chronologie des Theophanes im 7. und 8. Jahr.* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXI (1931), pp. 351-355).

to Theophanes' following of Syncellus in the Alexandrian reckoning (1), and although Dölger did not find this hypothesis altogether satisfactory (2), its later revival necessitated Ostrogorsky's refutation on the grounds of the March dating's relatively restricted usage and its failure to explain the chronological peculiarities of the September-based *Chronographia* (3). In identifying the source of Theophanes' chronological data for the period under review, a convenient point of departure was de Boor's conclusion that the regnal years of the popes and the three eastern patriarchs did not belong to Theophanes' chronological framework but were later interpolations into the *Chronographia* from Nicephorus' *Chronographikon Syntomon* (4), endorsed by Ostrogorsky since errors in these entries were not duplicated in the regnal years of Byzantine emperors, patriarchs of Constantinople, and Arab caliphs (5); de Boor further noted that although the three might not always coincide, a source with fixed dating of the world-year and the regnal years of the emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople was the foundation of Theophanes' chronology (6); but the tradition of the frequently anonymous chronological epitome was so widespread in Byzantium (7) that identification of the precise source of Theophanes' chronological canon may be presumed unlikely, although certainly it was not related to the source of Nicephorus' *Chronographikon Syntomon* (4):

(4) In which the list of emperors of the seventh century was incomplete (Constantine III and Heraclonas were omitted [p. 99 ll. 10-15] and in which the regnal years of the patriarchs of Constantinople in mid-century [p. 118, l. 10-p. 119, l. 5] were not congruent with Theophanes (8).

(1) V. GRUMEL, *L'année du monde dans la Chronographie de Théophane* (v. *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVIII (1937), pp. 396-408).

(2) F. DÖLGER, *Das Kaiserjahr der Byzantiner* (v. *Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Kl.* (1949, Heft 1), pp. 21-38).

(3) G. OSTROGORSKY, *V. Mošin: Marlovsko datiranje* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLVI (1953), pp. 170-175).

(4) C. DE BOOR, *op. cit.*, II, p. 484.

(5) G. OSTROGORSKY, *Die Chronologie des Theophanes im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert* (v. *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, VII (1930), pp. 1-56).

(6) C. DE BOOR, *Zu Theophanes* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, I (1892), pp. 591-593).

(7) H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig, 1885, II, 1, p. 389ff.

(8) H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, II, 1, pp. 384-388.

An original source was not necessarily subject to arbitrary regnal boundaries and was only rarely the later chronicler's sole source of information, so that examination of the primary sources for specific episodes in their chronological progression proved less rewarding than characterisation of each source as it emerged from the *Chronographia*, a process which was to reveal some ten antecedent sources of diverse type, weight, and provenance. Theophanes wrote not as an historian but as a chronicler, and therefore by tradition he would not seek for a coherent plan in the exposition of historical events to elucidate facts by discovering their causes and their effects; he would conceive of history as a successive chain of events to be arranged in year to year notes, and although these might be supplemented by abridgement or reproduction of longer works it was the short annal with its chronology that was the fundamental element of the chronicle form. De Boor, with whose judgement Gelzer concurred (1), attributed the annalistic brevity of the *Chronographia*'s narrative for much of Heraclius' reign (610-41) to his sources rather than to Theophanes himself when he identified two sources, one with an exclusive account of imperial family history and dated with indiction, month and day, and the second with a concise account of the Persians and Avars which was independently dated as to year and which showed some affinity with eastern chronicles (2). The first of these sources provided Theophanes' biographical notices of individual members of the imperial family (5), with Heraclius' accession (6) as its commencement and Constans II's accession (7) as its conclusion; while the chronological and factual skeleton of the second source, having provided a brief account of the Avar incursions in the first part of the reign of Heraclius (8) as well as the more detailed account of the Persian advance against the Empire in the reign of Phocas (9) and the first part of the reign of Heraclius (10), was amplified (in the first instance with additional unidentified material (11)) from the historical poems of George of Pisidia in the saga of Heraclius' Persian campaign (12) with the contemporaneous repulse of the combined

(1) H. GELZER, *Chalkedon oder Karchedon* (v. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, XLVI (1893), pp. 161-174).

(2) C. DE BOOR, *Zur Chronographie des Theophanes* (v. *Hermes*, XXV (1890), pp. 301-307).

Persian-Slav attack upon Constantinople in 626 (13) which were crowned by Heraclius' restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem and victorious return to Constantinople (14) :

(5) From Heraclius' marriage to Eudocia (Oct. 610) and the birth of Epiphaneia (July 611) [AM 6102, I, p. 299, ll. 7-14, II, p. 184, ll. 13-6], the birth of Heraclius Constantine (May 612) [AM 6103, I, p. 300, ll. 7-10, II, p. 184, ll. 29-31], the death of Eudocia and the subsequent coronations of Epiphaneia (Oct. 612) and Heraclius Constantine (Dec. 612) [AM 6104, I, p. 300, ll. 12-6, II, p. 184, ll. 31-6], the marriage of Heraclius and Martina (614) [AM 6105, I, p. 300, ll. 25-8, II, p. 185, ll. 9-11], the birth and elevation as Caesar of Constantine (617) [AM 6106, I, p. 301, ll. 6-7, AM 6108, I, p. 301, ll. 16-9, II, p. 185, ll. 18-9, 26-9], the birth of Heraclius' son David and his grandson Heraclius (Nov. 631) [AM 6122, I, p. 335, ll. 1-5, II, p. 210, ll. 2-5].

(6) After the Senate's treacherous incitement of the exarch of Carthage to revolt [AM 6101, I, p. 297, ll. 6-10, II, p. 182, l. 36-p. 183, l. 4], the expeditions of Heraclius and Nicetas, with the former's capture of Constantinople and coronation after the death of Phocas (4 Oct. 610) [AM 6102, I, p. 298, l. 15-p. 299, l. 7, II, p. 183, l. 24-p. 184, l. 13] (the correct date of Mon. 5 Oct. was established by Ostrogorsky with minimal alteration of the date of the *Chronicon Paschale*) (1).

(7) Heraclius' death (March 641) (recté 11 Jan. noted by Grierson from a tenth century *Necrologium Imperatorum*, in contrast to Nicephorus' generally accepted 11 Feb.) (2) was followed by the four month (Grierson endorsed Nicephorus' figure of one hundred and three days) (3) reign of Constantine III ended by poison [AM 6132, I, p. 341, ll. 12-7, II, p. 214, ll. 6-10], and that of Heraclonas and Martina ended by mutilation and banishment [AM 6133, I, p. 341, ll. 21-8, II, p. 214, ll. 13-7]. and the succession of Constans son of Constantine [AM 6134, I, p. 342, ll. 9-10, II, p. 214, ll. 21-33], when Theophanes reported his speech to the Senate in a direct quotation apparently authentic in tone and genuine in style and language, which might indicate its ultimate origin in an official source and which certainly reflected the contemporary significance of the Senate (4) ;but the corresponding narrative (unpublished when de Boor wrote) of the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxv-cxxvi,

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*

(2) P. GRIERSON, *Tombs and Obits of Byzantine Emperors* (v. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XVI (1961), pp. 3-63).

(3) P. GRIERSON, *op. cit.*

(4) C. DIEHL, *Le sénat et le peuple byzantin aux VII^e et VIII^e siècles* (v. *Byzantion*, I (1924), pp. 201-212).

p. 203, ll. 14-29] (which source had earlier [LXXXXVIII, p. 182, l. 37-p. 183, l. 2] shared with Michael the Syrian [XI, 3, II, p. 410, ll. 30-1] a comment upon Heraclonas' illegitimate birth from an incestuous union, without further links with Theophanes in that instance) might now call into question this strict division of sources.

(8) Their devastations in Europe (Thrace) from Heraclius' accession (612) [AM 6103, I, p. 300, ll. 1-3, II, p. 184, ll. 23-6], the khan's great raid in which Heraclius narrowly escaped capture at Heracleia (617) [AM 6110, I, p. 301, l. 26-p. 302, l. 4, II, p. 185, l. 34-p. 186, l. 8] and the peace negotiations (620) preparatory to Heraclius' Persian campaigns [AM 6111, I, p. 302, ll. 15-21, II, p. 186, ll. 21-3]. Theophanes' confused chronology of the great raid was resolved by Baynes to 5 July 617 (by alteration only of the year dating of the *Chronicon Paschale* as due to later manuscript displacement, rather than of the rest of its precise chronology to conform with Theophanes' erroneous 619, as did earlier historians) ⁽¹⁾ in direct refutation of Gerland's acceptance of 623 from the *Chronicon Paschale* ⁽²⁾.

(9) Which, sparked off by Chosroes II's reception of the alleged Theodosius son of Maurice and including the revolt of the Byzantine general Narses at Edessa in Mesopotamia, took the Persian armies from the Euphrates to Edessa (cf. ; *Chronicon Paschale* ad ann. 609 [p. 699, ll. 6-7]) and Chalcedon (603-9) via Mesopotamia, Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine, and via Armenia, Cappadocia, Galatia and Paphlagonia [AM 6095-6100, I, p. 291, l. 27-p. 296, l. 10, II, p. 179, l. 27-p. 182, l. 18], while the Jews of Antioch also revolted (610) [AM 6101, I, p. 296, l. 17-p. 297, l. 5, II, p. 182, ll. 21-33t ; but in participation and retribution and implication the Antiochene uprising was not thus limited ⁽³⁾ — Denis of Tellmahré noted the now-debated religious persecution which provoked it [p. 4, ll. 3-20] but without Fredegar's note on Heraclius' later forcible conversion of the Jews throughout the Empire [IV, 65, p. 153, ll. 7-11] (the tradition linking Heraclius' decree (632) with similar action in the Visigothic and Frankish realms is weak ⁽⁴⁾ and although this appeared in Michael the Syrian [XI, 4, II, p. 414, ll. 7-10], Heraclius' earlier toleration at Jerusalem [AM 6120, I, p. 328, ll. 15-20, II, p. 205, ll. 15-24] and protection of the Jews of Edessa [XI, 3, II, p. 410, ll. 1-6] (cf. : *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [LXXXXIX-CII, p. 184, l. 10-p. 186, l. 9] for far greater detail

(1) N. H. BAYNES, *The Date of the Avar Surprise* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXI (1912), pp. 110-128).

(2) E. GERLAND, *Die Persischen Feldzüge des Kaisers Herakleios* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, III (1895), pp. 330-352).

(3) A. SHARF, *Byzantine Jewry in the seventh Century* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLVIII (1955), pp. 103-114).

(4) J. STARR, *St. Maximus and forced Baptism at Carthage* (v. *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, XVI (1940), pp. 192-193).

and closer correspondence than Agapius of Hierapolis [p. 207, l. 15-p. 208, l. 2]) would suggest motives of political expediency rather than religious prejudice.

(10) When one Persian army under Sain and Saitos with the ultimate goal of the capture of Constantinople overran Asia Minor (610-14) [AM 6102-5, I, p. 299, l. 14-p. 300, l. 21, II, p. 184, l. 16-p. 185, l. 33] with final conquests in Galatia (619) [AM 6111, I, p. 302, ll. 22-3, II, p. 186, ll. 16-7] and an incursion as far as Chalcedon (620), while a second army under Sarbaras advanced against Syria (Damascus 613, Jerusalem 614, Antioch 615) [AM 6105-6, I, p. 300, l. 20-p. 301, l. 3, II, p. 185, ll. 3-18], Egypt and Africa (616-8) [AM 6106-8, I, p. 301, ll. 5-15, II, p. 185, ll. 20-6] until Heraclius, having made two abortive attempts at peace (613, 617) [AM 6105, 6109, I, p. 300, ll. 21-5, p. 301, ll. 21-4, II, p. 185, ll. 4-9, 30-33] began his first campaign against Persia (622) [AM 6113, I, p. 302, ll. 32-4, II, p. 186, ll. 24-6]. Restoration of the reading of AM 6108, reconstruction of the narrative and rectification of chronology was the work of de Boor and Gelzer⁽¹⁾; if the brevity of the notice for AM 6106 made it impossible to judge whether Theophanes was acquainted with Antiochus Strategus, Michael the Syrian's almost identical account of the Persian conquest of Egypt [XI, 1, II, p. 401, ll. 1-5] left no doubt of a common source; while the similarity in substance if not in style of the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens*' account of the dual evil suffered by the Roman state which led Heraclius and Gregory to conspire against Phocas from Africa showing how widespread this theme was ([AM 6100, I, p. 297, ll. 10-12, II, p. 182, ll. 16-8], Nicephorus [p. 3, ll. 9-11], cf. Agapius [p. 189, ll. 10-9]), and of the Persian conquest of Syria [Lxxxxx p. 177, l. 25-p. 178, l. 16] to Theophanes, with more detail anent the suffering of Edessa under Persian occupation [xxxxxvi-xcvii, p. 180, l. 22-p. 181, l. 21] than Michael the Syrian [XI, 3, II, p. 411, i, ll. 25-35], would appear to demonstrate a common tradition which, with similar links anent Heraclius' Persian campaigns, might indicate a relationship between those of Theophanes' sources separately identified by de Boor⁽²⁾ and Brooks⁽³⁾.

(11) Even assuming that Theophanes' annalistic source provided the notices of Heraclius' preparations for war (peace negotiations with the Avar khan, transportation of the army of Thrace to Anatolia, sequestration of the treasure of the churches, arrangements for the defence of Constantinople [AM 6111-3, I, p. 302, l. 15-p. 303, l. 8, II, p. 186, ll. 9-34]), of his rapid return to Constantinople from Armenia at the end of the first campaign and his failure to negotiate with

(1) C. DE BOOR and H. GELZER, *op. cit.*

(2) C. DE BOOR, *op. cit.*

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *The Sources of Theophanes and the Syriac Chroniclers* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XV (1906), pp. 578-587).

Chosroes before the second [AM 6113-4, I, p. 306, l. 6-p. 307, l. 2, II, p. 189, ll. 6-17], the first introduced a prose transcription of the *Expediitio Persica* and the second a meticulously detailed but alien account of the struggle to penetrate into Persia in the second campaign [AM 6114-6]; and if the same annalistic attribution can be made concerning the offensive and defensive measures of Heraclius and Chosroes respectively (626) [AM 6117, I, p. 315, ll. 2-17, II, p. 195, ll. 22-36] the narrative of the ensuing campaign can be represented as similarly alien, save that two items (the alliance with the west Khazar khan, giving Heraclius forty thousand troops in return for marriage to his daughter Eudocia, and Heraclius use of Sarbaras' intercepted death sentence to detach other Persian commanders from Chosroes) were present in the source of Michael the Syrian and that of Nicephorus [AM 6117, I, p. 316, ll. 13-6, II, p. 196, ll. 18-22, cf. : XI, 3, II, p. 409, ll. 12-5 and p. 16, ll. 10-6; AM 6118, I, p. 323, l. 25-p. 324, l. 9, II, p. 201, l. 33-p. 202, l. 18, cf. : XI, 3, II, p. 408, l. 30-p. 409, l. 11] and also in Agapius [p. 202, l. 21-p. 203, l. 5, p. 201, l. 10-p. 202, l. 20, p. 203, l. 5-p. 204, l. 13] and more closely in the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [LXXXVIII, p. 182, ll. 29-34, p. 181, l. 22-p. 182, l. 28] a source whose précis of the whole Persian war recalled that of Theophanes [LXXXIX-c, p. 183, ll. 3-36] although the account of the peace [c, p. 183, l. 37-p. 184, l. 8] was closer to Michael the Syrian [XI, 3, II, p. 409, ll. 32-6] and furthermore (in contrast to Theophanes) was substantially correct. The problem of the attribution of those parts of Theophanes' highly factual narrative unlikely to have been derived from the full *Heraclius III* cannot be resolved with certainty, and involved the equally intractable problem of further non-extant poems of George of Pisidia, in which respect a resumé of the scholarly speculation evaluated by Pertusi⁽¹⁾ was unnecessary here; similarly, circumstantial paraphrase of Theophanes' minute and authentic record was superfluous.

(12) For the first campaign (April 622-Jan. 623) in which Heraclius, under the palladium of the acheiropoieton ikon of Christ of Camuliana (but cf. : the *Homily* of Theodore Syncellus [p. 302, l. 28-p. 303, l. 13] and the *Oratio in festum Acathisti* ^(*) [col. 1356, l. 45-col. 1357, l. 12] for conflicting testimony of Sergius' invocation of this unique archetype or its miraculous facsimile in defence of Constantinople against the Avar onslaught of 626, George the Monk [p. 655, ll. 7-11] for a misplaced quotation, and Kitzinger for the artistic, theological, political importance of such miraculous images ^(*), retrained the Byzantine army and drove the Persians from Asia Minor [AM 6113,

(1) A. PERTUSI, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-31.

(2) *Oratio historica in festum Acathisti*, ed. J. P. Migne, P.G., XCII.

(3) E. KITZINGER, *The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm* (v. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), pp. 83-150).

I, p. 303, l. 9-p. 306, l. 8, II, p. 186, l. 35-p. 189, l. 7] Theophanes transposed into prose the three parts of the *Expositio Persica*, written (622-3) as a detailed description of the campaign in which George of Pisidia himself participated; *Heraclius I* and *Heraclius II* were written at the moment of Heraclius' triumph over Persia after the death of Chosroes when presumably the fact of victory alone was known, and although *Heraclius II* (rather than the *In Heraclium ex Africa redeuntem*, George's first historical poem written 619-20) provided [ll.12-6] Theophanes' note of Heraclius' voyage from Africa under the protection of the Theotokos [AM 6102, I, p. 298, ll. 16-7, II, p. 183, ll. 26-7], a précis [ll. 153-72] of *Heraclius III* and an allegorical paean upon the downfall of Chosroes [ll. 214-21], these first two parts were more purely commemorative with few military allusions; thus it was the fragmentary but more factual *Heraclius III* (derived either from Heraclius' letters to Constantinople or alternatively from conversation with the emperor himself on his return) which supplied Heraclius' exhortation to his troops before the re-entry into Persian territory for the second campaign (spring 623), for the further exhortation after the move from winter quarters and the battle on the Sarus which terminated this indecisive campaign in Armenia (625) [AM 6114, I, p. 307, ll. 1-19, II, p. 189, l.19-p. 190, l. 2, cf. : III, 3; AM, 6115, I, p. 310, l. 26-p. 311, l. 2, II, p. 192, ll. 26-31, cf. : III, 6; AM 6116, I, p. 314, ll. 2-10, II, p. 194, ll. 19-25, cf. : III, 18-9], with intimations of Heraclius' threefold division of his army before the third campaign (626-8), his exhortation to his troops not to be disheartened by the Khazar defection (627), the single combat of Razates and Heraclius, Heraclius' letter to Chosroes protesting his love of peace, and Chosroes' death (628) [AM 6117, I, p. 315, l. 12, II, p. 195, l. 32, cf. : III, 36 AM 6117, I, p. 317, l. 18, II, p. 197, ll. 5-6, cf. : III, 26; AM 6118, I, p. 318, l. 4-p. 319, l. 3, II p. 197, l. 23-p. 198, l. 13, cf. : III, 34, 47; AM 6118, I, p. 324, ll. 17-20, II, p. 202, ll. 19-22, cf. : III, 30; AM 6118, I, p. 326, l. 25-p. 327, l. 12, II, p. 204, ll. 7-21, cf. : III, 52]; while Heraclius' victorious return to Constantinople after seven years of war, a paradigm of the Almighty's work of creation, could come from no other source than George of Pisidia [AM 6119, I, p. 327, l. 26-p. 328, l. 6, II, p. 204, l. 36-p. 205, l. 5, cf. : III, 54].

(13) Of the two poems which George of Pisidia wrote (626) to commemorate the failure of the massive Avar attack upon Constantinople in coincidence with the continued Persian presence at Chalcedon (the relevant fragments of *Heraclius III* were apparently excerpted from the *Bellum Avaricum*), the *In Bonum patricium*, dedicated to the magister militum to whom (together with the patriarch Sergius) Heraclius had entrusted the defence of the capital during his own absence on campaign, and the *Bellum Avaricum*, which gave a vivid description of the ten day siege of Constantinople and the city's miraculous deliverance with accurate and authentic information despite the poetic character of its more than five hundred

iambic trimetres, Theophanes took the *Bellum Avaricum* for his source [AM 6117, I, p. 316, ll. 16-25, II, p. 196, ll. 23-34, cf. : ll. 197-200, 401, 175-222, 447, 232-343]; although Theophanes did not use the *Homily* of Theodore Syncellus, written by one of the legates sent to the khan to sue for peace (vd. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 721, l. 4-p. 722, l. 13]) and surveying earlier Byzantino-Avar relations as introduction to the most complete extant document of the siege, Theodore and George were aware of each other's work [*Homily*, p. 304, ll. 17-9, p. 305, l. 35, *Expeditio Persica III*, ll. 45-6, *Heraclius III*, 50a]; Barišić's study of the assault was of especial value for its detailed reconstruction and observations upon the various seventh century narratives⁽¹⁾; the nature of Theophanes' sources precluded him not only from comment upon the devastation of Greece by the Slavs in the first decade of the seventh century, but also from consideration of the establishment and historical significance of Slav control of the Peloponnese for more than two centuries from 587-805, which must be sought in other sources such as the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*⁽²⁾.

(14) In these notices (629-30) [AM 6119-20, I, p. 327, l. 26-p. 328, l. 8, ll. 15-28, II, p. 205, ll. 6-7, 24-9] the *In restitutionem Sanctae Crucis* (written in 630 to hail the culmination of Heraclius' Persian victory) was self-evident in one of the most complex chronological problems of Heraclius reign⁽³⁾; Theophanes antedated the peace with Persia to 627 and then, being aware that the restoration of the Cross took place in 629 and thinking that Heraclius' sojourn in Syria extended at least to Nov. 631 [AM 6122, I, p. 335, ll. 1-2, II, p. 210, ll. 2-3], displaced Heraclius' return to Constantinople to 628 without reference to Antiochus Strategus [p. 516, ll. 29-45]; whereas although Nicephorus (or his source) made no use of this eyewitness evidence, the accounts tally and Nicephorus has the correct order of events [p. 21, ll. 18-20, p. 22, ll. 3-18], but his limited correspondence with the *Brief History of the Avar Dispersal* [p. 335, ll. 56-60] was no greater than could be explicable by normal familiarity with the synaxarium; Theophanes' error was due probably to confusion over the order of succession to the Persian throne after civil war [AM 6120, I, p. 329, ll. 1-10, II, p. 205, ll. 30-8; AM 6123, I, p. 335

(1) F. BARIŠIĆ, *Le siège de Constantinople par les Avars et les Slaves* (v. *Byzantion*, XXIV (1954), pp. 371-395).

(2) P. CHARANIS, *On the Question of the Slavonic Settlements in Greece during the Middle Ages* (v. *Byzslav.*, X (1949), pp. 254-258); *The Chronicle of Monemvasia and the Question of the Slavonic settlements in Greece* (v. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, V (1950), pp. 139-161); *On the Slavic Settlement of the Peloponnese* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLVI (1953), pp. 91-103).

(3) N. H. BAYNES, *The Restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem* (v. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII (1912), pp. 287-302).

ll. 19-21, II, p. 210, ll. 8-9] for James of Edessa [p. 214, I, ll. 6-13] followed by Michael the Syrian [XI, 3, II, p. 410, ll. 20-6, XI, 5, II, p. 418, ll. 1-3] gave a different order to that of Elias of Nisibis [p. 26, ll. 27-36], with Agapius [p. 192, ll. 8-15, p. 204, l. 14-p. 205, l. 10] and the more detailed *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [CIII, p. 186, ll. 14-25, crv, p. 187, l. 35-p. 188, l. 2] corresponding to Michael the Syrian, while the correct order of succession after Chosroes II, and of events (Heraclius' negotiations of peace as prelude to the Persian withdrawal from Greek frontiers and the restoration of the Cross) was found in Sebeos [p. 2, ll. 16-8; ch. 28, p. 39, ll. 3, 18, 26], Nicephorus [p. 20, l. 4-p. 21, l. 12], and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [c, p. 183, l. 37-p. 184, l. 8].

Theophanes' debt to George of Pisidia was definitely demonstrated by Sternbach⁽¹⁾ and was utilised in Pernice's study of Heraclius' campaigns in an endeavour to supplement the chroniclers' incomplete study of the reign by extracting policy from panegyric⁽²⁾, if at the possible price of accepting and propagating and perpetuating pro-imperial propaganda⁽³⁾ for the God-guarded [*Expediitio Persica* II, 24] monarchy⁽⁴⁾, but whether the debt was by direct quotation or via the intermediary of an earlier prose chronicle based especially upon *Heraclius III* was less certain. Baynes' affirmative conclusion in this regard⁽⁵⁾ may be reinforced by the *Chronographia*'s silence anent the *In restitutionem Sanctae Crucis*' somewhat obscure reference to alleged miraculous healings when the Cross was restored to Jerusalem [l. 29, linked by Pertusi to *Hexameron* l. 1822] suggestive of a correction in the interests of historical accuracy by an editor thus knowledgeable to intervene, and extended in respect to the narrative of the siege of Constantinople by Barisic's identification of the *Chronicon Paschale* as representing an older tradition than those preserved either by Theophanes or Nicephorus and additionally by his detection of

(1) L. STERNBACH, *De Georgii Pisidiae apud Theophanem aliosque historicos reliquiis*, loc. cit., pp. 1-107

(2) A. PERNICE, *L'imperatore Eraclio, Saggio di storia bizantina*, Florence, 1905, *passim*.

(3) P. LEMERLE, *Quelques remarques sur le règne d'Héraclius* (v. *Studi Mediaevali*, Ser. III, T. I (1960), pp. 347-396).

(4) P. J. ALEXANDER, *The strength of empire and capital as seen through Byzantine eyes* (v. *Speculum*, XXXVII (1967), pp. 339-359).

(5) N. H. BAYNES, *op. cit.*

an independent and more faithful use of Theophanes' chronicle source by Scylitzes (recte Cedrenus) ⁽¹⁾; but this issue was possibly of greater relevance to the source traditions of Nicephorus' *Breviarium* and George the Monk's *Chronicle* which will be considered in their turn. Theophanes' incomplete chronicle source tradition from the Empire's eastern provinces, whose annals for the reign of Heraclius recorded the history of the Persians and of the Avars with little interest in that of Constantinople or of the West, revealed an unexpectedly extensive affinity with the Syriac chroniclers. Further links with non-Byzantine sources were provided by Krumbacher's early recognition of a Greek Syriac source of undetermined nature and authorship in Theophanes narrative of Muhammad and the Caliphate ⁽²⁾; and these were to be verified and amplified by Pigulevskaja's identification as the common basis of the *Chronographia* and the *Chronicon anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dicitur* an unknown short chronicle or chronicles providing year to year notes, one of which from 558 (an. Sel. 868) was characterised by a chronology usually wrong by eight years and apparent in the history of the Arabian conquest of Syria (629-82) [an. Sel. 940-93, AM 6124-27] and the parallel story of Muhammad (621, 627) [an. Sel. 932, 938, AM 6122] ⁽³⁾. Yet it nevertheless remained hypothetical to link the former source with that Syriac chronicle source which, having introduced the detailed expositions of the history of Monotheism ⁽¹⁵⁾ and of the life of the Saracens' leader and so-called false prophet ⁽¹⁶⁾, provided the accounts of the Arab conquests (of Syria ⁽¹⁷⁾, of Mesopotamia ⁽¹⁸⁾, of Egypt ⁽¹⁹⁾) dominating Heraclius' last decade and an interesting if not always accurate record of the natural phenomena occurring in the course of the reign ⁽²⁰⁻²¹⁾, and which was a constant factor for these themes throughout Theophanes' history of the seventh century:

⁽¹⁵⁾ Under the notice of Heraclius' proceedings in Syria (630) by a virtual summary of Anastasius' *In vitam ... Maximi*; omitting that part which dealt purely with the life of Maximus [col. 72, B, 1, 8-col. 76, B, l. 8], from the doctrine's evolution by Athanasius

(1) F. BARIŠIČ, *op. cit.*

(2) K. KRUMBACHER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 343.

(3) N. FIGULEVSKAYA, *Theophanes' 'Chronographia' and the Syrian Chronicles* (v. *Jahr. d. österr. Byz.*, XVI (1967), pp. 55-60).

the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, its endorsement by Sergius of Constantinople and adoption by Heraclius in the *Ecthesis* (638) despite the resistance of Sophronius of Jerusalem [AM 6121, I, p. 329, l. 21-p. 330, l. 29, II, p. 206, l. 2-p. 207, l. 7, cf. : col. 76, B, l. 1-col. 81, A, l. 6], imperial power-politics in Constantinople (641) [AM 6121, I, p. 330, l. 29-p. 331, l. 6, II, p. 207, ll. 7-15, cf. : col. 81, A, l. 11-C, l. 11], the condemnation of Monotheletism by councils of the African provinces and Rome [AM 6121, I, p. 331, ll. 6-21, II, p. 207, ll. 17-32, cf. : col. 81, C, l. 13-col. 85, C l. 12], and the elevation of pope Martin and the summoning of the Lateran council (although Theophanes omitted the acta thereof found in the *Vita*) and Constans' vengeance upon Martin and Maximus [AM 6121, I, p. 331, l. 22-p. 332, l. 5, II, p. 207, l. 32-p. 208, l. 6, cf. p. 18, l. 23, p. 22, l. 19-23, 1, col. 85, D, l. 1-col. 88, A, l. 3]; the notice of the final condemnation of Monotheletism came presumably from Theophanes' eastern source (for the statement was repeated in Michael the Syrian at the end of an account of Monotheletism from the Jacobite standpoint [XI, 9, II, p. 433, I, l. 20-p. 437, I, l. 5]. cf. : *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxx, p. 206, l. 15-p. 208, l. 31] for reproduction in greater detail of the Maronite apologetic of Simon of Qennesre — a common source contribution which would be anathema to Theophanes), with the election of pope Agathon and his convocation of the council at Rome (680) [AM 6121, I, p. 332, ll. 5-6, II, p. 208, ll. 6-8 (with lacuna) cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 11, II, p. 447, II, ll. 5-7], in apparent ignorance (for pontifical regnal years did not feature in the *Chronographia* for mid-seventh century) that between Martin and Agathon there had elapsed a period of twenty three years and the reigns of four popes, a common error that could only have come from a common source; Theophanes also referred to the *Vita* for patriarchal appointments at Constantinople in the reign of Constans [AM 6121, I, p. 331, ll. 5-7, 22-4, II, p. 207, ll. 13-5, 30-2; AM 6145, I, p. 345, ll. 5-6, II, p. 216, ll. 22-3, cf. col. 84, C, l. 1-col. 85, C, l. 12]; but by its nature as hagiography the *Vita Maximi* did not allow Theophanes to consider the care and time with which first Monenergism and then Monotheletism⁽¹⁾ had been evolved by the patriarch and adopted by the emperor to reconcile by thoughtful compromise provinces such as Armenia, and Syria and Egypt as well as leading Persian Christians to Chalcedon⁽²⁾, nor the effectiveness of the combination of the leadership of Maximus and the peculiarly African ecclesiology of provincial autonomy within the Church buttressed by indepen-

(1) V. GRUMEL, *Recherches sur l'histoire du Monothélisme* (v. *Échos d'Orient*, XXVII (1928), pp. 6-16, 257-277 : XXVIII (1929), pp. 272-282 : XXIX (1930), pp. 16-28).

(2) L. BRÉHIER, *Histoire de l'Église* (ed. Fliche et Martin), V, pp. 115-118.

dence from and rejection of the Byzantine *Reichskirche* ⁽¹⁾ to spear-head western resistance to and ultimate universal non-acceptance of Monotheletism, nor the complexity of policies and relationships and attitudes ⁽²⁾ consequent upon imperial determination to maintain the political and religious unity of the Old and New Romes, cf. : the Greek *Life* of pope Martin which narrated the Eastern-dominated ⁽³⁾ Lateran council and its condemnation of Monotheletism [II, p. 254, l. 11-p. 255, l. 4], the dispatch of Calliopas by Constans [III, p. 255, ll. 5-26] and the council as the exarch's justification for his arrest of the pope [IV, p. 256, l. 1-p. 257, l. 2], drawing presumably upon a Greek chronicle for the first item and certainly upon Martin's correspondence for the other two — a significant narrative in its omission of Martin's alleged treasonable activities (his assumption of the papacy without imperial sanction, and his unsubstantiated collusion in the revolt (649-52) of Olympius) and in its illustration at this point and later of the extent to which Anastasius the Bibliothecarius transposed the text of the papal letters he translated in his *Collectanea* — while the short-lived Italian/Sicilian revolt of Olympias was not known to Theophanes.

(16) Following the notice of the death of Muhammad (631); the narrative correspondence between the *Chronographia* and Bartholomew of Edessa's *Contra Mahometem* [AM 6122, I, p. 333, l. 4-p. 334, l. 27, II, p. 208, l. 23-p. 210, l. 2, cf. : col. 1446, D, l. 1-col. 1449, C, l. 15, col. 1456, C, ll. 1-15] was clear, even although Theophanes omitted the summary of Muhammad's teaching (based apparently upon Islamic traditions) ⁽⁴⁾ and made no reference to the *Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni* less definitely attributed to Bartholomew ⁽⁵⁾, but the uncertain duration of Bartholomew's life-span left the balance of the dependent relationship in doubt; that there was evidence of a common tradition between Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 403, l. 16-p. 405, l. 25] and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [LXXXXIV-LXXXXV, p. 178, l. 17-p. 180, l. 20] anent Muhammad's life and teaching which was not reproduced in Theophanes might indicate a deliberate choice of an alternative source by the latter, and an independent use of this common material by Bartholomew.

(1) R. A. MARKUS, *Reflections on religious dissent in North Africa in the Byzantine period* (v. *Studies in Church History*, III (1966), pp. 140-150).

(2) D. M. NICOL, *The Byzantine view of Western Europe* (v. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, VIII, 4 (1967), pp. 315-339).

(3) E. KASPAR, *Die Lateransynode von 649* (v. *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch.* LI (1932), pp. 75-137).

(4) W. EICHNER, *Die Nachrichten über den Islam bei den Byzantinern* (v. *Der Islam*, XXIII (1936), pp. 132-162, 197-244).

(5) W. EICHNER, *op. cit.*

(17) From the deceptive first unsuccessful probing raid (632) and the offensive organised by Muḥammad's successors abu-Bakr and 'Umar culminating in Khalīd's Palestinian advance which brought Heraclius to Syria in person [AM 6123, 6122, 6124, 6125, I, p. 335, l. 12-p. 336, l. 3, p. 333, ll. 1-3, p. 336, ll. 14-6, II, p. 210, ll. 11-27, p. 208, ll. 21-3, p. 210, ll. 30-2] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 4, II, p. 413, ll. 17-36] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cvi, p. 188, l. 5-14 ; cviii, p. 189, l. 7-p. 191, l. 22]), [I, p. 336, l. 28-p. 337, l. 12, II, p. 211, ll. 7-22] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 5, II, p. 417, ll. 31-4, p. 418, ll. 10-36] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cvii, p. 188, l. 30-p. 189, l. 6]) before the battle of the Yarmūk (636) and the fall of the great Byzantine strongholds of Damascus, Jerusalem, Antioch and the north Syrian towns (Caesarea alone remained until 641) and Heraclius' evacuation gave the Arabs complete mastery from Egypt to the Euphrates by 639 [AM 6126, I, p. 338, ll. 3-12, II, p. 211, l. 32-p. 212, l. 4] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 6, II, p. 420, l. 31-p. 421, l. 4] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxI, p. 191, l. 9-p. 192, l. 9 ; cxiv-cxv, p. 194, l. 8-p. 195, l. 12]) [AM 6127, I, p. 339, ll. 15-29, II, p. 212, l. 27-p. 213, l. 8] (cf. : Agapius [p. 215, l. 18], Michael the Syrian [XI, 7, II, p. 425, l. 26-p. 427, l. 12], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxvii, p. 196, l. 26-p. 197, l. 3 ; cxx, p. 199, l. 1-p. 200, l. 9]), [AM 6129, I, p. 340, ll. 12-4, II, p. 213, ll. 21-4] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 7, II, p. 420, ll. 24-6] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxvi, p. 195, l. 13-p. 196, l. 25]) [AM 6133, I, p. 341, ll. 21-3, II, p. 214, ll. 11-13] (cf. : Agapius [p. 218, ll. 10-11] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxiv, p. 202, l. 29-p. 203, l. 14]). The actual course of the conquest of Syria was relatively clear, although the sources did not distinguish between the four Arab armies of Amr, Yazīd, Shurabīl and Khalīd, and it was therefore difficult to establish the precise routes and dates of their various campaigns (?), but with the exception of the dating of Heraclius' evacuation of Syria [AM 6125, I, p. 337, ll. 5-10, II, p. 213, ll. 21-4] (recté Michael the Syrian [XI, 7, II, p. 424, ll. 26-8]) and minor discrepancies anent the numbers of the opposing forces and identity of the Byzantine commander at the Yarmūk [AM 6126, I, p. 338, ll. 6-8, II, p. 211, ll. 20-2] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 6, II, p. 420, l. 31-p. 421, l. 4], Fredegar [IV, 66, p. 154, ll. 2-3], *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* [p. 336, I, l. 23, p. 337, I, l. 35-p. 338, I, l. 8, p. 337, II, l. 35-p. 338, II, l. 9], John of Nikiu [ch. 111, p. 436, ll. 8-11]), Theophanes' detailed chronology was confirmed by Michael the Syrian rather than by Nicephorus.

(18) Which, unreinforced like Armenia, after Heraclius' repudiation of the tribute agreed by the governor of Osroene (637) fell to 'Iyāḍ emir of Syria (640) with the surrender of Edessa and the reduction of Constantia and Daras [AM 6128, 6130, I, p. 340, ll. 2-10, 20-6,

(1) P. K. HIRTI, *History of the Arabs*, London, 1958, pp. 150-152.

II, p. 213, ll. 11-20, 25-32] (cf. : Agapius [p. 217, l. 3-p. 218, l. 18], Michael the Syrian [XI, 7, II, p. 426, ll. 13-8, 20-5, p. 427, ll. 25-7], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxi, p. 200, l. 14-p. 201, l. 8]), while Sassanid Persia was destroyed by Sa'd [AM 6131, I, p. 341, ll. 2-7, II, p. 213, l. 33-p. 214, l. 5] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 6, II, p. 421, l. 24-p. 422, l. 27 ; XI, 7, II, p. 423, l. 34-p. 424, l. 18] corresponding to the more detailed *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxiii, p. 193, l. 2-p. 194, l. 7 ; cxxxiii, p. 213, ll. 20-33]). Despite Heraclius' military reorganisation of the province ⁽¹⁾, the great Armenian fortress of Dvin fell in Oct. 641 ⁽²⁾.

(19) In a brief and incomplete presentation (reproduced also in Agapius [p. 211, l. 10-p. 214, l. 17] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 7, II, p. 425, ll. 2-26, p. 424, l. 34-p. 425, l. 1] although not without internal inconsistency and with more detail upon earlier events in the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxviii, p. 197, l. 4-p. 198, l. 27]) of the locally negotiated tribute which resulted in the indictment of Cyrus patriarch of Alexandria to Constantinople and the vain resistance offered by the Armenian Manuel as augustalius so that Cyrus' negotiation for the victorious Arabs' withdrawal were fruitless (636-9, although Theophanes made no note of passing years) [AM 6126, I, p. 338, l. 10-p. 339, l. 4, II, p. 212, ll. 2-26] ; a narrative contradicted not only by that of Nicephorus [p. 24, l. 16-p. 25, l. 8] but also by that of John of Nikiu [ch. 111, p. 433, l. 21-p. 434, l. 14 ; chs. 112-3, p. 436, l. 16-p. 440, l. 15 ; ch. 115, p. 442, ll. 5-15 ; ch. 119, p. 450, ll. 5-9 ; ch. 120, p. 455, l. 27-p. 456, l. 18] for the military progress from the first invasion (Dec. 639) to the fall of Alexandria (Oct. 641) and for [ch. 116, p. 444, ll. 13-9 ; ch. 119, p. 452, ll. 3-18] the rôle of Cyrus ; Zotenberg ⁽³⁾, followed by Brooks ⁽⁴⁾, ascribed the textual confusion of the *Chronicle* to manuscript displacement, and certainly a seventh century Egyptian source was probably more acceptable than ninth century versions of Byzantine or Syriac material.

(20) Even with some notices being provided by the independent Constantinopolitan traditions of the *Chronicon Paschale* and of Nicephorus and by the Theophanes' derivations of George the Monk and George Cedrenus (which will be considered below in their turn), even with the parlous state of Byzantine chronography both in the seventh century and in its latter day survival, even with the supra-

(1) L. BRÉHIER, *La transformation de l'empire byzantin sous les Héraclides* (v. *Journ. des Savants*, NS. XV (1917), pp. 401-415).

(2) H. MANANDEAN, *Les invasions arabes en Arménie* (v. *Byzantion*, XVIII (1948), pp. 163-195).

(3) H. ZOTENBERG, *Mémoire sur la Chronique byzantine de Jean, évêque de Nikiu* (v. *Journ. Asiat.*, ser. VII, T. XIII (1879), pp. 348, 386).

(4) E. W. BROOKS, *On the Chronology of the Conquest of Egypt by the Saracens* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, IV (1895), pp. 435-444).

national character of Byzantine civilisation, the relative disinterest of contemporary Constantinople in such phenomena contrasted with the observations (however imperfect) of the Syrian province, although only with caution should the descriptions of eclipses and comets and other natural phenomena be accepted as an index of regional literary and scientific awareness. Nor was the establishment of chronological criteria from meteorological observations by any means straightforward; although the tracks of total eclipses have been calculated and mapped the estimated occurrence of an eclipse was no guarantee that it was observed or recorded, while the pattern of source transmission could result in the importation into a chronicle written at Constantinople of phenomena invisible from the capital, or alternatively the chroniclers could be silent anent phenomena irrelevant to their own locality (for instance, Theophanes' Greek Syriac source made no mention of eclipses of June 606 and April 646 total in Asia Minor and 90 % at Constantinople, or of the total Mediterranean eclipse of Dec. 698) or anent phenomena presumably observable (for instance, Halley's comet in spring 607 and Dec. 684-Feb. 685). Further, if the "basic period" of eclipse cycles viz. : 521 Julian or 537 lunar years was known to seventh century Byzantium [John of Nikiu, ch. 102, p. 417, ll. 18-22, anent an Antiochene eclipse (Mar. 601)], the eleven year sunspot cycle accompanied by great auroral displays with clearly determined maxima c. 643, 655, 664 prevailed unrecognised by contemporaries in the early Middle Ages, so that the chroniclers' subjective and highly coloured descriptions require a date (which was not always provided) for identification of a single manifestation, since these notices were presumably subject to the same "borrowing" as those of eclipses and might variously be interpreted as meteors or comets. Although the apparitions of major comets (and similarly the occurrence of major earthquakes) has been established with relative certainty, the incidence of undated narratives in the sources might be attributed equally to further reference to a known phenomenon or to a separate notice of an unfixed phenomenon; it should be noted that Grumel's specialist bibliography (from which full investigation may be made) ⁽¹⁾ did not include Fritz's chronology of European aurorae ⁽²⁾. With much general information and specific corrections throughout owed to Dr. D. J. Schöve, the present study only collated the testimony of the sources; and the corroborative value of Arab sources in other areas of this study prompted regret that no common ground for appraisal was afforded by the *Kashf as-salsalah'an wasf az-zalzala* of the Egyptian polymath Jelal'ed

(1) V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie* (= *Traité d'Études byzantines*, I), Paris, 1956, p. 469.

(2) H. FRITZ, *Verzeichniss beobachteter Polarlichter*, Vienna, 1873.

din As-Soyuti (d. 1506), a scientific explication and catalogue of earthquakes experienced in Asia and Africa (628-1500) whose data was extremely trustworthy from its concurrence with the original Arab authorities and independent Byzantine and Latino-European sources ⁽¹⁾.

(21) Of which relatively few were preserved by Theophanes, viz. : (610) an independently noted but erroneously dated eclipse of the sun with flood and famine in Michael the Syrian [XI, I, II, p. 401, I, ll. 18-25] (of recorded contemporary eclipses in Mar. 601, June 606, May 616, Nov. 617 the mention of famine identified that of 617) which was the first of six notices unrepresented in the *Chronographia*, (Oct. 627-June 628) a great eclipse (recté dimming of solar light due to volcanic dust) found in Agapius [p. 192, ll. 3-6] and in corresponding notices of Michael the Syrian [XI, 3, II, p. 411, I, ll. 31-18] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [LXXXXVII, p. 181, ll. 18-21], independent and undated notices of famine among the Greeks and of locust swarms in Agapius [p. 190, ll. 13-14+18], (629) an auroral display and eclipse [p. 192, ll. 15-6, p. 201, ll. 8-9] followed by (630 ? text obscure) an earthquake and further eclipse [p. 208, l. 10] recorded by Agapius if with suspect testimony and chronology (Agapius cannot be precisely reconciled with the aurorae observed in the Far East c. 628, c. 642-4 and the calculated but unrecorded partial solar eclipse of June 634), (633) the Palestinian earthquake and portentous comet perhaps deliberately antedated to herald the Arabs by Theophanes [AM 6124, I, p. 336, ll. 21-4, II, p. 211, ll. 2-5] which was described also by Denis of Tellmahré (to whom the second phenomenon was a rain of shooting stars [p. 5, ll. 26-30]) and by Agapius (in respect of the comet [p. 194, ll. 5-7]) and correctly dated to 634 by Michael the Syrian [XI, 4, II, p. 414, ll. 3-6] (the date of the Palestinian earthquake was possibly 632, while that of the much-described comet was Sept. 634) (639), bubonic plague recorded in Palestine by Michael the Syrian (with an antedated discrepancy of a decade) [XI, 3, II, p. 411, I, ll. 1-4] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [CXXIV, p. 200, ll. 8-9], undated notices of a thirty-day earthquake in Palestine with wider plague plus lance-like comet (? partial duplication of earlier entry) and an earthquake in Armenia reproduced from their common source by Agapius [p. 208, ll. 10-11, p. 209, ll. 4-6] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 5, II, p. 419, I, ll. 1-8, 20-7] ; possibly Theophanes' notice (609-10) of an exceptionally cold winter prior to Heraclius' accession [AM 6101, I, p. 297, ll. 11-12, II, p. 183, ll. 5-6] came from Constantinopolitan annals, and certainly that of a lunar eclipse (Jan. 623) incidentally in the course of Heraclius' first Persian

(1) N. N. AMBRASEYS, *On the Seismicity of South-West Asia : Data from a XV Century Arabic Manuscript* (v. *Revue pour l'Étude des Calamités*, XXXVII (1961), pp. 18-30).

campaign came from George of Pisidia [AM 6113, I, p. 305, ll. 1-4, II, p. 188, ll. 8-11, cf. : *Expositio Persia III*, 1] ; neither Theophanes' lunar eclipse nor the later undated Palestinian and Armenian phenomena of Agapius and Michael the Syrian were confirmed by Grumel⁽¹⁾.

Yet in addition from the accession of Phocas and the final derivations of Theophanes from Theophylact⁽²²⁾, there was evident in the *Chronographia* as a supplement to the annals of the imperial family a further and more discursive Constantinople-oriented source for the reign of Phocas (602-10) which was also represented in other chroniclers of the seventh and ninth centuries⁽²³⁾, in the *Chronicon Paschale* and in John of Nikiu, in the undated John of Antioch and in Nicephorus (whose *Breviarium* was conceived as a chronicle-form continuation of Theophylact's eight book *History* of the reign of Maurice (582-602)⁽²⁴⁾ but executed in a restricted format and with a reduced content which in themselves were a comment in comparative historiography) ; so that it might reasonably be assumed that a further continuation of this tradition provided Nicephorus' independent source for the reign of Heraclius, the interests of which were apparently the events within the capital and the personal achievements of the emperor⁽²⁵⁾, in a narrative which was generally divergent from that of Theophanes⁽²⁶⁾ and which coincidentally ended in 641⁽²⁷⁾ :

(22) Viz. : the fate of Maurice's family and the miraculous announcement of his death in Alexandria [AM 6095, I, p. 291, ll. 5-26, II, p. 179, ll. 19-27] (cf. : Theophylact [VIII, 12, 13, 15, p. 309, l. 28- p. 310, l. 12, p. 313, ll. 13-21, p. 314, ll. 17-26]).

(23) The abortive revolt of Germanus and Constantia the widow of Maurice to overthrow Phocas and restore Theodosius the son of Maurice whom they still believed to be alive, was placed by Theophanes (606-7) [AM 6098-9, I, p. 293, ll. 9-21, p. 294, l. 27-p. 295, l. 14, II, p. 180, ll. 25-35, p. 181, ll. 21-37] due to his division of the narrative of 605 into two years, so that the *Chronicon Paschale*'s notice of the execution of the conspirators (June 605) was correctly dated [p. 696, l. 6], while the entry of Maurice's brother-in-law Philippicus into religious life [AM 6098, I, p. 293, ll. 23-4, omitted by Anastasius] was also noted by John of Antioch [p. 149, ll. 2-4] and by Nicephorus [p. 15, l. 16-p. 17, l. 2] : the marriage of Phocas' daughter Domentzia to Priscus the comes excubitorum, and the

(1) V. GRUMEL, *op. cit.*, pp. 461, 471, 479.

subsequent estrangement of the two men (608) was noted by Theophanes [AM 6099, I, p. 294, ll. 11-27, II, p. 181, ll. 7-21] by John of Antioch [p. 153, ll. 10-15] and by Nicephorus [p. 4, ll. 7-10]; from the correspondence between the names of the ringleaders, and the silence of the *Chronicon Paschale*, the conspiracy which aimed at the execution of Phocas in the hippodrome (610) [AM 6101, I, p. 297, l. 17-p. 298, l. 4, II, p. 183, ll. 8-24] might be connected with the earlier incident rather than with the revolt of the Greens [AM 6101, I, p. 296, l. 25-p. 297, l. 5, II, p. 182, ll. 29-36] (cf. : John of Antioch [p. 149, ll. 15-9]) which had been preceded by the seditious communication of Priscus with Heraclius exarch of Carthage (609) [AM 6100, I, p. 295, l. 27-p. 296, l. 3, II, p. 182, ll. 2-10] because of the Empire's desperate state [AM 6100, I, p. 297, ll. 10-12, II, p. 182, ll. 16-8] (cf. : Nicephorus [p. 3, ll. 9-11]); Heraclius' voyage from Abydus to Constantinople and Phocas' measures to defend his capital (610) [AM 6102, I, p. 298, l. 15-p. 299, l. 7, II, p. 183, l. 24-p. 184, l. 10] (cf. : John of Antioch [p. 149, l. 20-p. 150, l. 15]) was apparently the last entry in this source as Theophanes knew it, for from this point the narrative of John of Antioch paralleled that of Nicephorus in the firing of Caesarion by the Greens, the capture of Phocas by Photinus (Photius) and his mutilation and death following his encounter with Heraclius on board ship, and the burning of Phocas' body (together with those of his chief associates — it should be noted in passing that the unanimity of the sources upon the fate of Bonossus effectively precluded Macler's identification of Phocas' prefect of the East with Heraclius' *magister militum*)⁽¹⁾ in the Bull [p. 150, ll. 13-32; cf. : p. 4, l. 4-p. 5, l. 7], while a similar account was provided by the *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 700, l. 13-p. 701, l. 8] although its earlier narrative (609) of the revolt of Africa and Alexandria with the Persian capture of Edessa was independent [p. 699, ll. 4-7], and John of Nikiu related the fortunes of Heraclius' family in Constantinople under Phocas [ch. 106, p. 421, ll. 1-11] before a confused but connected version of Phocas' death [ch. 111, p. 432, l. 23-p. 433, l. 3].

(24) The slightly unexpected starting date when the accession of Heraclius in 610 would have been more obvious, the proximity of the *Breviarium* (N° 66) to the *Historia* (N° 65) in Photius' *Bibliotheca* (*) [I, p. 79, l. 22-p. 98, l. 28], the repetition of this order in the Vatican codex (Vat. Graec. 977) suggesting the preservation in Photius' library of both works in a single codex which was possibly the archetype of the Vatican, all would indicate that Nicephorus wrote (and was recognised as so doing) with the intention of continuation.

(25) So marked was this interest that Orosz (studying, partly editing, partly collating with the Vatican manuscript of the *Bre-*

(1) H. MACLER, *op. cit.*, p. 56, n. 2.

(2) PHOTIUS: *Bibliotheca*, ed. and tr. R. Henry, Paris, 1959.

viarium definitively edited by de Boor, the London manuscript of the *Breviarium*) accepted (erroneously, in Dujčev's opinion) ⁽¹⁾ Burckhardt's linguistic division of the London codex ⁽²⁾ and suggested that, from the death of Phocas to the inauguration of Heraclius' Persian campaigns Nicephorus used a non-extant poem of George of Pisidia (dubiously, in Pertusi's opinion) ⁽³⁾ rather than an unknown historical source by an unknown author, and that from the latter point to the deposition of Philip Bardanes (the text's conclusion) Nicephorus used a second unknown historical source by an unknown author which was written in the ninth century and common with Theophanes; although the comments of Dujčev and Pertusi effectively undermined Orosz' analysis of sources, the work was valuable for its establishment of variant readings between the two codices, and for its determination that the codices were not derived from the same archetype but were two distinct versions of the *Breviarium* by Nicephorus himself, the London codex being a late ninth century manuscript of an earlier version of a prototype which appeared in the eleventh or twelfth century Vatican codex stylistically revised and chronologically extended ⁽⁴⁾.

(26) Of the coronation of Heraclius [p. 5, ll. 8-16], of the fate of Priscus in the context of the defence of Syria against the Persians [p. 5, l. 16-p. 7, l. 2] (cf. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 703, l. 5-p. 706, l. 21] and John of Antioch [p. 149, ll. 31-2] for distortion of the common tradition), the funeral of Eudocia [p. 7, ll. 12-27] and Heraclius' marriage to Martina [p. 9, ll. 1-6], the births [p. 5, l. 30, p. 14, l. 12-p. 15, l. 2, p. 15, ll. 18-20, p. 22, ll. 2-3] coronations [p. 9, ll. 1-6, p. 22, l. 26-p. 23, l. 3, p. 26, ll. 27-8, p. 27, ll. 4-7] and marriage alliances [p. 9, ll. 6-7, p. 15, ll. 10-20, p. 22, ll. 2-3, p. 24, l. 29-p. 25, l. 3, p. 21, ll. 17-20, p. 21, ll. 20-22] of Heraclius' children; the narrative of the *Chronicon Paschale* in this context restricted to events (611-3) [p. 702, ll. 12-4, p. 703, ll. 3-8, p. 702, ll. 16-8, p. 703, l. 19-p. 704, l. 2, p. 702, l. 19-p. 703, l. 1] was apparently not related to those of Theophanes or Nicephorus, nor were its notices of the war's harmful repercussions upon the currency (615) and corn supply (618, 626) of Constantinople [p. 706, ll. 9-11, p. 711, ll. 12-5, p. 715, l. 9-p. 716, l. 7], and its continued lack of correspondence concerning Heraclius' negotiations with the Persian commander besieging Chalcedon [p. 9, l. 12-p. 12, l. 14] (cf. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 706, l. 9-p. 709, l. 24] and Sebeos [ch. 26, p. 78,

(1) I. DUJČEV, *The London Manuscript of Nikephoros' Breviarium*, edited with an Introduction by L. Orosz (v. *Byzslav.*, XII (1951), pp. 255-258).

(2) J. BURCKHARDT, *Der Londoner Codex des Breviarium des Nikephoros P.* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, V (1896), pp. 465-477).

(3) A. PERTUSI, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-31.

(4) L. OROSZ, *The London Codex of Nikephoros' Breviarium*, edited with an Introduction, Budapest, 1948, *passim*.

l. 1-p. 79, l. 2]), the Avar surprise [p. 12, l. 29-p. 14, l. 10] (cf. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 712, l. 12-p. 713, l. 13]), the Persian capture of Jerusalem and Heraclius' initiation of the Persian wars [p. 15, ll. 5-16] (cf. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 704, l. 13-p. 705, l. 2, p. 713, l. 19-p. 714, l. 3]), the Persian-Avar assault upon Constantinople [p. 17, l. 16-p. 19, l. 2] (cf. : *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 716, l. 9-p. 726, l. 10]) would suggest that the latter source used eyewitness or oral testimony supplemented by the brevity and abundant factual detail of official sources in the last instance, in its characteristically distinct compilation wherein chronological computations with imperial fasti and ecclesiastical notices predominated; hypotheses that the *Chronicon Paschale* extended significantly beyond its precisely dated terminal year (629) ⁽¹⁾, or that it was a seventh century continuation of a mid-fourth century chronicle ⁽²⁾, have not been sufficiently substantiated ⁽³⁾ and do not affect the source-affiliations under review; Nicephorus' narrative, without differentiation of three campaigns, gave a version of Heraclius' alliance with the Khazars and Chosroes' intercepted letter, a unique description of the great fire-temple at Ganzak destroyed with its astral ceiling and its "Throne of Chosroes" ⁽⁴⁾, with the influence of *Heraclius III* clearly apparent in the single combat of Heraclius and Rizates and the death of Chosroes [p. 16, l. 16-p. 17, l. 14], while the *Chronicon Paschale* reproduces Heraclius' third letter from Persia to the people of the capital [p. 727, l. 8-p. 734, l. 16]; Nicephorus made little mention of natural phenomena, noting famine and plague rampant in Constantinople (618) merely as two of the factors determining Heraclius to transfer the imperial capital to Carthage [p. 9, ll. 14-8], but the *Chronicon Paschale* independently and accurately noted an earthquake at Constantinople (April 611) [p. 702, ll. 8-10] and the appearance of a bright star in the east (recté comet) (March 626) [p. 715, ll. 6-7]; Nicephorus' narrative of Boutelinus [p. 7, l. 28-p. 8, l. 28], of Heraclius' despairing and frustrated decision to transfer the imperial capital to Carthage [p. 9, ll. 14-8], of the relations between Heraclius

(1) A. PERNICE, *op. cit.*, pp. IV, VIII, 172.

(2) F. C. CONYBEARE, *On the Date of the Composition of the Paschal Chronicle* (v. *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, II (1900), pp. 288-298). *The Relation of the Paschal Chronicle to Malalas* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XI (1902), pp. 395-405).

(3) H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig, 1885, II, pp. 138-141. Th. MOMMSEN, *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, M.G.H., Auct. Antiq. XI, Berlin, 1881, p. 203. J. MERCATI, *A Study of the Paschal Chronicle* (v. *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, VII (1906), pp. 397-412). F. C. CONYBEARE, *The Codex of the Paschal Chronicle used by Holstein* (v. *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, VII (1906), pp. 390-396).

(4) K. LEHMANN, *The Dome of Heaven* (v. *The Art Bulletin*, XXVII (1945), pp. 1-27).

and the Bulgar chiefs Organas and Kouvrat [p. 12, ll. 20-30, p. 24, ll. 9-15] (cf. : John of Nikiu [ch. 120, p. 460, ll. 4-13] was not found in Theophanes ; Nicephorus also provided an independent account for the loss of Byzantine Syria, with notices of the defeats of Sergius and Theodore Trithyrius without date or place or system [p. 23, ll. 13-7, p. 23, l. 22-p. 24, l. 2] following which even the placing of Heraclius' dilatory return to Constantinople [p. 25, l. 27-p. 26, l. 8] after the conspiracy of his natural son John Atalarichus and nephew Theodore magister [p. 25, ll. 16-26] ⁽¹⁾ has been questioned and antedated to 634 (cf. : Sebeos [ch. 35, p. 93, l. 8-p. 94, l. 6]) ⁽²⁾ to provide a link with the estrangement of Heraclius from his brother Theodore [p. 23, ll. 6-11] (cf. : Theophanes [AM 6125, I, p. 337, ll. 3-5, II, p. 211, ll. 13-4]), and for the loss of Egypt where John of Barkaina and Marinus were successively sent by Heraclius to defeat before the condemnation of Cyrus patriarch of Alexandria by Heraclius after the further defeat of Marianus the cubicularius [p. 24, l. 16-p. 25, l. 8], as well as for the succession to the imperial throne (Feb.-Sept. 641) when Heraclius' death was followed by Martina's unsuccessful bid for power before the reign of Constantine III and that of Heraclonas and Martina which saw the revolt of Valentinus to procure the coronation of Constans II as co-emperor [p. 27, l. 7-p. 30, l. 30].

(27) The sum total of information of the *Breviarium* [p. 31, l. 28-p. 32, l. 2] concerning the reign of Constans, that Constantine son of Heraclius ruled for twenty-seven years and was murdered in Sicily, was reproduced from the *Chronographikon Syntomon* [p. 99, ll. 12-3] where Constantine IV was noted as the grandson of Heraclius [p. 99, l. 16] ; since the *Breviarium* lacked the overthrow of Heraclonas and Martina, and since John of Nikiu gave the reigns of Constantine III and Heraclonas with the revolt of Valentinus Arsacidus [ch. 116, p. 445, ll. 4-8 ; ch. 120, p. 453, l. 12-p. 454, l. 7] culminating with Heraclonas' deposition [ch. 120, p. 459, l. 20-p. 460, l. 6] followed by Valentinus' revolt against Constans and his share in the vain Byzantine attempt to regain Alexandria (645) [ch. 120, p. 462, ll. 5-14, p. 463, ll. 5-9], material presumably drawn from a related Greek source, it would therefore seem probable that Nicephorus' source continued to Constans' accession but was incomplete in the late eighth century, or that some limited manuscript loss has occurred from the *Breviarium* at this point.

Although no help in reconstructing these non-extant sources was offered by the *Chronicle* of George the Monk which was compiled in

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 99-100.

(2) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

respect of its historical material principally from the *Chronographia* with some limited use of the *Breviarium* (28). nor by the later compilations of Leo Grammaticus' *Chronographia* (29) and George Cedrenus' *Historical Epitome* (30) which broadly represented either the extant ninth century chroniclers or divergent traditions, it may be suggested with confidence that for the years 602-10 Theophanes and to a lesser extent Nicephorus used John of Antioch or his source (an unresolvable and here irrelevant distinction) with material related to the so-called *Megas Chronographos*, identified by Freund as Nicephorus' source for the years 610-41 (1) and thus (from its contemporary and Constantinopolitan provenance) the probable ultimate origin of the occasional correspondence noted above between the *Breviarium* and the narratives of the *Chronicon Pascale* and the *Chronicle* of John of Nikiu :

(28) For the years 602-41, the accession of Phocas was a précis of Theophanes [p. 663, l. 17-p. 664, l. 2], the accession of Heraclius a combination of both Theophanes and Nicephorus [p. 665, l. 7-p. 667, l. 20], Persian advances in the first part of Heraclius' reign from Nicephorus [p. 668, l. 12-p. 669, l. 6, p. 670, ll. 1-3] but with Theophanes' fuller notices of the fall of Jerusalem [p. 670, ll. 3-9], the Avar incursions were abridged from Nicephorus [p. 669, ll. 7-20], as was the account of Heraclius' Persian campaigns [p. 670, l. 9-p. 672, l. 3] and the Avar assault upon Constantinople [p. 670, l. 18-p. 671, l. 5], but Heraclius' restoration of the Cross to Jerusalem [p. 672, ll. 8-18] and triumphal return to Constantinople came from Theophanes [p. 672, l. 19-p. 673, l. 8] as did the brief statement of Heraclius' espousal of Monotheletism [p. 673, ll. 3-9], the notice of Muḥammad's life and teaching (amplified with a more detailed account based on St John of Damascus' *De haeresibus Liber* [p. 699, l. 11-p. 701, l. 15 ; cf. : col. 763, A, l. 1-col. 765, C, l. 15, col. 772, D, l. 1-col. 773, A, l. 15] although the description of the prayer to Aphrodite went beyond this [p. 705, l. 17-p. 706, l. 13], and with a long harangue against Muḥammad's errors [p. 702, l. 10-p. 705, l. 16] from an unknown source apparently unique to George the Monk among the Byzantines and of Islamic origin (2) [p. 697, l. 12-p. 699, l. 10, p. 701, ll. 15-21]) and the battle of the Yarmūk [p. 707, ll. 13-7] (both displaced to the reign of Constans, the latter to constitute George the Monk's sole statement of Arab conquests despite his reproduction

(1) A. FREUND, *Beiträge zur antiochenischen und zur konstantinopolitanischen Stadtchronik*, Jena, 1882, pp. 34ff.

(2) W. EICHNER, *op. cit.*

of Theophanes' notice of its celestial portent [p. 706, l. 21-p. 707, l. 3]), while if the earlier of George the Monk's two other notices of natural phenomena viz. : the exceptionally cold winter prior to Heraclius' accession [p. 664, ll. 12-5] came from Theophanes there was no ascertainable source for his addition of a solar eclipse and a rain of ashes to Nicephorus' account of the disasters of 618 [p. 670, ll. 5-7] although a solar eclipse was in fact recorded for Nov. 617, but Heraclius' death was drawn from Nicephorus [p. 673, ll. 12-8] ; unfortunately the *Chronicle* gave no precise answer for the problem of manuscript loss in the *Breviarium* anent 641, since George the Monk gave only a bare mention of the ascension and reign of Constantine III [p. 673, ll. 20-1] (the bulk of the subsequent narrative owing more to legend than to history) and was apparently unaware of the reign of Heraclonas [p. 697, ll. 9-10], but nevertheless, in view of the widely circulated opinion that only the last part of the *Chronicle* (viz. : 813-43) is of independent value since the earlier years had been written up from Theophanes alone, a restatement of the original determination of George the Monk's indebtedness (1) might not be unprofitable.

(29) A reading of the *Chronographia* and the *Historical Epitome* would suggest that Leo Grammaticus used three and George Cedrenus four principal sources to chronicle the years 602-41 ; the *Epitome* (a tradition to be considered in its turn) provided Leo Grammaticus with a vignette of Phocas and his reign [p. 143, ll. 10-18], the burial of Maurice and his family in the monastery of St. Mamas with the metrical epitaph of Constantine's tomb [p. 144, l. 17-p. 145, l. 10], a description of Heraclius' appearance [p. 147, ll. 18-21], a portrait of Constantine III with detail of his coronation and burial which erroneously allotted to him a year's reign and a wife Anastasia who was buried with him through confusion with Constantine IV and misplaced Pyrrhus' succession to Sergius as patriarch of Constantinople [p. 155, l. 18-p. 156, l. 13], and a statement of Heraclonas' coronation and four month reign among material taken from Theophanes [p. 156, l. 14-p. 157, l. 3] ; the Constantinopolitan tradition of which Nicephorus was an exponent from 610 noted Philippicus' withdrawal to Chrysopolis [p. 145, ll. 11-2] and the hostilities with Chosroes of Persia and the Avars in Thrace [p. 145, ll. 12-6] before the hippodrome riot which led Phocas to build the Magnaura arsenal [p. 145, l. 18-p. 146, l. 1], Crispus' summons to bring Heraclius to Constantinople where his defeat of Phocas' fleet led to the latter's arrest by Photinus and his mutilated death on board Heraclius' ship [p. 146, l. 5-p. 147, l. 3] (which prompted Leo to insert a monastic reflection upon the divine purpose of Phocas' reign [p. 147, ll. 3-8]),

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 130. Cf. : K. KRUMBACHER, *op. cit.*, p. 354 ; G. MORAVCSIK, *op. cit.*, I, p. 277.

Crispus' retraction in Cappadocia of his initial allegiance and his conventual confinement in Constantinople [p. 147, l. 17 ; p. 147, l. 21-p. 148, l. 11], Saitos' devastating advance to Chalcedon where his negotiations with Heraclius determined his own fate and that of the Byzantine ambassadors [p. 149, l. 17-p. 150, l. 3], Heraclius' last illness and burial [p. 155, ll. 6-16] ; undated and often abbreviated, Theophanes served as Leo Grammaticus' source for the death of Maurice and his sons which was concluded by a misplaced note on that of Constantina and her daughters [p. 143, l. 18-p. 144, l. 17], for the cold winter in which the sea froze and fish died [p. 145, ll. 16-7], Heraclius' coronation and marriage [p. 147, ll. 10-7], the Persian advance (612-7) [p. 148, ll. 12-22], the Avar surprise and consequent truce [p. 148, l. 22-p. 149, l. 11], Heraclius' inception of the Persian campaigns [p. 149, ll. 13-6 ; p. 150, l. 4-p. 151, l. 2] with the Avar repulse from Constantinople [p. 151, ll. 3-11] and their victorious climax [p. 151, l. 12-p. 152, l. 14] celebrated in the triumphal return from Jerusalem [p. 154, l. 17-p. 155, l. 3], the emergence of Muḥammad (with the addition of the prophesy of Stephen of Alexandria) [p. 152, l. 15-p. 153, l. 3] and his teaching [p. 153, l. 4-p. 154, l. 12] with the succession of abu-Bakr [p. 154, ll. 12-6], Heraclius' espousal of Monotheletism [p. 155, ll. 4-6], and finally the deposition of Heraclonas and Martina [p. 156, l. 14-p. 157, l. 3] with Constans' speech to the Senate upon his accession [p. 157, ll. 5-15].

(30) Although no further light was shed upon Theophanes' sources by Leo Grammaticus' text, George Cedrenus' narrative of the events of 626 suggested to Barišić an independent and more faithful use of Theophanes' chronicle source⁽¹⁾, for into the congruent account of Heraclius' dispositions for the third campaign [p. 727, ll. 7-11, 15-21, p. 727, l. 21-p. 728, l. 14] during which Sarbaras besieged Chalcedon and the khan Constantinople in vain [p. 728, ll. 14-7, 19-23, p. 729, ll. 18-20] were inserted divergent details of the status of the Avar khan's subject tribes and of the transport of the Slav monoxyles for the assault [p. 727, ll. 11-15, p. 728, ll. 17-9] (cf. : Nicephorus [p. 18, l. 6], Theodore Syncellus [p. 303, ll. 25-7 ; p. 307, l. 17, p. 313, l. 33], *Chronicon Paschale* [p. 720, l. 16]) as well as a miracle of the Virgin [p. 728, l. 23-p. 729, l. 18] unknown to Theophanes and possibly from the synaxarion, but this greater clarity and depth was not maintained anent the rest of the reign ; George Cedrenus' simplified chronology came from Theophanes, as did the dating of Phocas' accession [p. 708, l. 14] which was miraculously announced at Alexandria [p. 710, ll. 1-7] before Phocas' consular largesse [p. 710, ll. 8-9] and the later execution of Constantina and her daughters [p. 711, ll. 3-7, 12-6] preceeding Crispus' communication with the African exarch [p. 711, l. 19-p. 712, l. 2], Heraclius' dated coronation

(1) F. BARIŠIĆ, *op. cit.*

[p. 713, l. 20-p. 714, l. 1] with the chronicle of his family history [p. 714, ll. 16-9, p. 715, ll. 4-6, 13-5, 21-3, p. 750, ll. 18-21] and the careful if contradictory chronology of his death [p. 752, ll. 14-5], the threat of the Persians and Avars from Maurice's death [p. 708, ll. 5-13] as preface to the Persian advance in the reign of Phocas (together with the revolt of the Jews of Antioch) [p. 710, ll. 9-17, p. 710, l. 18-p. 711, l. 2 (the former notice abbreviated and the latter confused), p. 711, ll. 7-9, 16-7, p. 712, ll. 3-15] and in the first decade of the reign of Heraclius [p. 714, ll. 6-16, p. 714, l. 22-p. 715, l. 4, p. 715, ll. 7-13, 16-20, p. 716, ll. 1-3, p. 717, ll. 1-6] while penetration of Thrace reached a climax in the Avar surprise [p. 716, ll. 14-22], Heraclius' three Persian campaigns [p. 719, l. 9-p. 721, l. 2, p. 721, l. 3-p. 727, l. 6 p. 727, l. 11-p. 728, l. 14-p. 729, l. 21-p. 734, l. 23] with his triumphal return to Constantinople [p. 735, ll. 1-13] and subsequent progress through the East [p. 735, l. 14-p. 736, l. 3] where he embraced Monothelism [p. 736, l. 4-p. 737, l. 15 (a precis of Theophanes' detailed narrative)] while the Arab offensive launched by Muḥammad [p. 751, ll. 1-15] achieved under 'Umar the conquest of Syria [p. 745, l. 5-p. 746, l. 6, p. 746, l. 8-22, p. 751, l. 22-p. 752, l. 2] and Mesopotamia (with Sassanid Persia) [p. 751, ll. 16-21, p. 752, ll. 3-11] and the invasion of Egypt [p. 746, l. 7]; another source provided George Cedrenus with homiletic parallel of the impious disruption of the Church and the infidel devastation of the Empire [p. 737, l. 16-p. 738, l. 2] and topographical-biblical exegesis on the Holy Land [p. 747, l. 1-p. 750, l. 17], while George the Monk furnished Theophanes' biography of Muḥammad with John of Damascus' analysis of his teaching and his own harrangue against his errors [p. 738, l. 12-p. 744, l. 24] and in addition the notice of the thirty day comet following his death [p. 745, ll. 1-4]; exhaustive examination of the relationship between George Cedrenus and Leo Grammaticus would be inappropriate here but despite occasional divergent renderings and omissions or additions it would seem probable that Leo Grammaticus was the source for the execution of Maurice and his sons (but not of Constantina and her daughters) and their burial at St. Mamas' with the somewhat incongruous epitaph on Constantina's tomb [p. 706, l. 6-p. 708, l. 2] followed by Philippicus' withdrawal to Chrysopolis [p. 708, ll. 3-4] and later report of the fate of Theodosius [p. 705, ll. 12-23], with Phocas' portrait and character sketch which was elaborated by Leontius [p. 708, ll. 14-23], for the cold winter which was additionally preceeded by great mortality of man and beast from famine and plague [p. 708, l. 23-p. 709, l. 3], the hippodrome riot against Phocas [p. 708, ll. 3-11] before Heraclius' arrival at Constantinople and Photinus' revenge caused Phocas' death [p. 712, l. 9-p. 713, l. 7] which prompted reflection upon the purpose of his reign [p. 713, ll. 14-9], the portrait of Heraclius [p. 714, ll. 1-6] and the fate of Crispus [p. 713, ll. 8-14] and negotiations with Saitos [p. 718, ll. 6-15] which preceeded Heraclius' preparations for war [p. 717, l. 18-p. 718, l. 6] and inauguration of the first Persian cam-

paign [p. 718, l. 16-p. 719, l. 8] and the details of Heraclius' last illness and burial [p. 752, l. 15-p. 753, l. 2]; George Cedrenus' composite chronicle of 641 illustrated the problems of source attribution, since the death of Constantine III and the coronation of Heraclonas came from Leo Grammaticus [p. 753, ll. 3-20] as did his private burial with Martina [p. 754, ll. 4-6], but the reign of Heraclonas (which included the Arab capture of Caesarea and the patriarchal succession at Constantinople) and the accession of Constans came from Theophanes [p. 753, l. 16, p. 753, l. 20-p. 754, l. 4, p. 754, ll. 6-14], while the simultaneous banishment of Valentinian [p. 753, l. 23-p. 754, l. 1] appeared in neither and contradicted his rôle in Constans' accession portrayed in Nicephorus' incomplete narrative.

The historiography of the mid-seventh century presented two problems, the greater in identification of the sources for Theophanes' narrative and the lesser in explanation of Nicephorus' silence, and in both instances the foundations for subsequent speculations were laid by Brooks. The attribution of Nicephorus' abrupt transition from the reign of Heraclonas (May-Sept. 641) to the death of Constans II in Sicily (July 668) to massive manuscript loss on the *Breviarium* for the years 641-668 ⁽¹⁾ cannot be substantiated from the *Chronicle* of George the Monk ⁽³¹⁾ which provided no conclusive indication as to the state of the *Breviarium* and the nature of its narrative at this point during the ninth century, but it may be discounted not so much by the fact that Photius knowing the *Breviarium* in approximately the form in which it is extant today made no mention of Nicephorus' account of the reign of Constans as by the fact that neither version of the dual manuscript tradition of the *Breviarium* contained any account of the reign of Constans, and therefore if the somewhat unconvincing hypotheses that Nicephorus deliberately omitted an account of the reign of the heretical emperor ⁽²⁾ or that he found nothing of interest in the reign were disregarded, Nicephorus was silent because he was ignorant :

(31) George the Monk excerpted his narrative of Byzantine history for the reign of Constans (viz. : the great storm and violent wind (648), the naval action (655), Constans' removal to and murder in Sicily with Mezzizus' revolt (668), and the subsequent relations of

(1) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

(2) G. PATZIG, *Leo Grammaticus und seine Sippe* (v. Byz. Zeitschr., III (1894), pp. 470-497).

Constantine IV and his brothers) from Theophanes [p. 697, ll. 10-2, p. 716, l. 8-p. 717, l. 8, p. 717, l. 23-p. 718, l. 8], and his narrative of the foundation of the sect of the Paulicians in Armenia by Constantine Silvanus [p. 718, l. 9-p. 725, l. 11] (not found in Theophanes) from Peter Higoumenus of Sicily (¹).

Even from Brooks' initial recognition that the lack of contemporary authority for the secular history of the descendants of Heraclius rendered the later seventh century one of the most obscure periods in the history of the Empire where knowledge was dependent upon the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian and the *Chronographia* of Theophanes since Nicephorus reproduced in shorter form one of the sources of Theophanes and later Greek writers reproduced either Theophanes or his source (²), and from Ostrogorsky's note that the meagre allusions of the seventh century sources of Theophanes and Nicephorus to the West indicated a contemporary Byzantine disinterest or ignorance in striking disparity with the frequent detailed references to the East (³), it was a certainly unexpected and possibly novel conclusion that for the intermission between the termination of his independent annalistic source in 641 and the inception of the common chronicle source with Nicephorus in 668 Theophanes was forced to rely entirely upon a Greek Syriac chronicler of the Arab world in default of Byzantine historical material. It must be acknowledged that this limitation of Theophanes' sources and the consequent attribution of George the Monk's historical narrative for the reign of Constans to Theophanes contradicted Brooks' identification of distinct "eastern" and "western" sources (³²), but Leo Grammaticus' record of mid-seventh century history in fact went far towards disproving this source-criticism since it contained elements that might be held to derive from both Byzantine and Syrian interests in a combination clearly

(1) C. DE BOOR, *Der Bericht des Georgios Monachos über die Paulikianer* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VII (1898), pp. 40-49. H. GRÉGOIRE, *Les sources de l'histoire des Pauliciens* (v. *Bulletin de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, XXII (1936), pp. 35-53).

(2) E. W. BROOKS, *The Brothers of the Emperor Constantine IV* (v. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XXX (1915), pp. 42-51).

(3) G. OSTROGORSKY, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century* (v. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XIII (1959), pp. 1-21).

dependent upon Theophanes (33), while that of George Cedrenus was purely derivative (34):

(32) Via analysis of the naval action of 655 and the relations of Constantine IV and his brothers to show that Theophanes and George the Monk independently used the same western or Byzantine source, Theophanes in combination with his eastern or Syriac source and George the Monk in isolation, but although Brooks' conviction of this sources existence had an obvious connection with his earlier (and ultimately unacceptable) attempt to prove large-scale manuscript loss from Nicephorus it was otherwise inadequately documented⁽¹⁾; Baynes' study of Theophanes' combination of eastern and Byzantine sources in the notice of Heraclius' restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem provided a point of departure for the determination of an independent tradition for George the Monk's history of the Heraclians by its identification of a Constantinopolitan chronicle which transmitted part of George of Pisidia's *Heraclias III* now lost separately to Theophanes and George the Monk⁽²⁾, although after consideration of the narrative of the whole reign it seemed unlikely that George the Monk used a source independent of, or in addition to, Theophanes and Nicephorus; similarly, in the light of a study of the chronicle sources for the whole of the seventh century, it was unconvincing that George the Monk did anything but abbreviate the *Chronographia* for the reign of Constans since the existence of Brooks' independent Byzantine source remained with a verdict of "not proven".

(33) Viz.: Mu'awiyah's destruction of the Colossus of captured Rhodes [p. 157, ll. 15-22] which was followed by his victory over Constans off Phoinike [p. 157, ll. 22-p. 158, l. 10] despite which sedition within the Caliphate forced him to sue for peace [p. 158, ll. 18-23], Constans' persecution of Maximus and Martin and execution of Theodore his brother [p. 158, ll. 11-16] before his own murder at Syracuse heralded the usurpation of Mezizus [p. 158, l. 23-p. 159, l. 3] which Constantine IV personally suppressed [p. 159, ll. 6-12], and Constantine IV's shortlived rule with his brothers who were mutilated after a plot on their behalf [p. 159, ll. 14-9]; the *Epitome* provided only a divergent tradition of patriarchal succession to Constantinople (653) [p. 158, ll. 16-8] and the surname of Pogonatus for Constantine IV [p. 159, ll. 12-4].

(34) George Cedrenus took only Constantine IV's surname of Pogonatus from Leo Grammaticus [p. 746, ll. 6-7] for the bulk of his narrative came from Theophanes with continued presentation

(1) E. W. Brooks, *On the Chronology of the Conquest of Egypt by the Saracens* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, IV (1895), pp. 459-462).

(2) N. H. Baynes, *op. cit.*

in an annalistic format, with the destruction of Mu' āwiyah's fleet at Tripolis and the battle off Phoinike [p. 755, l. 15-p. 756, l. 16] prominent in a selective survey of the Caliphate's external expansion [p. 755, ll. 1-5, 8-10, l. 764, ll. 4-11] and internal history [p. 754, ll. 15-20, p. 762, ll. 3-7], notices of the natural phenomena of the earlier part of the reign [p. 754, ll. 21, 22-3, p. 755, l. 7] and of Constans' Slav campaign [p. 761, ll. 20-1], Constans' persecution of Martin and Maximus and execution of Theodore his brother so that popular hatred forced him to leave Constantinople [p. 761, l. 21-p. 762, l. 2, p. 762, ll. 8-11, p. 762, l. 18-p. 763, l. 2] for Syracuse which was the scene of the later coup d'état suppressed by Constantine IV [p. 763, ll. 12-22] (derived from Theophanes but with additions of unlikely fancy [p. 762, ll. 11-18, p. 763, ll. 16-7] and unproven fact [p. 763, l. 22-p. 764, l. 1]) and in conclusion Constantine IV's rule with his brothers until their mutilation after the Chrysopolis agitation and their ultimate banishment [p. 764, ll. 1-2, 8-14, p. 770, ll. 20-1]; George Cedrenus took the foundation and teaching of the Armenian sect of the Paulicians [p. 756, l. 17-p. 761, l. 19] from George the Monk.

That the house of Heraclius had few chroniclers and not a single historian would appear a facet of the general sterility caused by the political situation of the Empire which was forced to direct all its energies towards defence against its external enemies, thereby creating conditions practically prohibitive of any intellectual or artistic activity not only in those provinces torn from the Empire but also in its oft-threatened capital and those provinces which still formed part of it, but Kaegi offered a stimulating if not altogether convincing explanation in his concept of a self-imposed moratorium upon all historiography among contemporary orthodox Byzantines. The Armenian Monophysite Sebeos and the Coptic Jacobite John of Nikiu were able to make a *prima facie* explanation of the catastrophic impact of Islam from the third decade of the seventh century as irrefutable examples of divine retribution for the Chalcedonian errors of the imperial government, illustrative of the Eusebian doctrine of the intimate relation of the fortune of the Church with that of the State in a pragmatic confirmation of non-Chalcedonian theology; but Kaegi himself went on to cite St. Anastasius the Sinaite who in the late seventh century (unadmitted as contemporary with John of Nikiu) correlated Arab military successes with the excesses of Constans II against the orthodox and Byzantium's external peace with Constantine IV's restoration of the Church's unity, and (perhaps more pertinently) to acknowledge the theoretical derivation of Theophanes and Nicephorus from lost

prototypes in addition to the impediment of the disruption of the seventh and eighth centuries to earlier orthodox Byzantine historians if not to Sebeos or John ⁽¹⁾. An obviously contemporary explanation for the disasters of the 630's was provided by Heraclius' incestuous marriage ⁽³⁵⁾ and this was reinforced by Frolow's study of Heraclius' calculated propaganda exercise reflected in the independent attempts by Antiochus Strategus and Nicephorus to authenticate with the improbable detail of the reliquary's unbroken seals the Cross restored by Heraclius and Martina to Jerusalem ⁽²⁾; for those alienated from orthodoxy, when the Arabs could be welcomed as defenders of the [Monophysite] Church of Christ (Theophilus of Alexandria, at the end of the seventh century ⁽³⁾), or as providential deliverers from the cruelty and anger and bad faith of the Romans (Michael the Syrian [XI 4, II, p. 412, l. 36-p. 413, 2]), then their conquests were not disasters and no more profound explanation than the merely military (Michael the Syrian [XI 4-7, II, *passim*]) was necessary :

(35) Although no mention appeared in Theophanes at least one chronicler was revolted at the impious union, rebuked by the Church and duly punished by the birth of deformed children and at the end by Heraclius' sufferings in his last illness, which some twenty years later was specifically identified by Heraclius' brother Theodore as the cause of the Syrian disasters (Nicephorus [p. 14, ll. 12-5, p. 27, ll. 7-12, p. 23, ll. 6-11]), while sonship of an incestuous union was a factor in the revolt against Heraclonas (John of Nikiou [ch. 120, p. 453, ll. 12-3]).

Viewed in the overall perspective of Byzantine chronography Sebeos and John were the last representatives of older provincial traditions which continued unbroken only in Syria, while John was contemporary with the revival of the chronicle at Constantinople. The vital rôle of Theophanes' non-extant Greek Syriac chronicle source necessitated examination of its nature and transmission, more especially since its identification as his unique authority for the mid-seventh century entailed the derivation of four

(1) W. E. KAEGI JR., *Initial Byzantine Reactions to Arab Conquest* (v. *Church Hist.*, XXXVIII (1969), pp. 139-144).

(2) A. FROLOW, *La vraie Croix et les expéditions d'Heraclius en Perse* (v. *Rev. des Ét. Byz.*, XI (1953), pp. 88-105).

(3) H. FLEISCH (ed.), *Une homélie de Théophile d'Alexandrie* (v. *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, XXX (1935-6), pp. 374-375).

major episodes of contemporary Byzantine history from a source of characteristic brevity, a source whose basic annalistic format established for the reign of Heraclius and continued for those of Constantine III and Heraclonas (36) was maintained throughout the reign of Constans II :

(36) The fall of Caesarea in Palestine (641) to Mu'āwiyah after a seven year siege [AM 6133, I, p. 341, ll. 21-3, II, p. 211, ll. 11-3] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 8, II, p. 430, ll. 35-7] for a far fuller account) ; the chronological contradictions of the two sources were reconciled by Hitti (1).

Exposition of this source might profitably be preceded by discussion of the pioneer studies of Brooks towards identification of the common source underlying much of the seventh and early eighth century narratives of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian, the development and the corroboration of this work in the light of more recently published primary sources and of other chronicle traditions, and its contribution to the emerging perspective of a single Byzantino-Syriac tradition for the historiography of the seventh century. A Monophysite Syriac chronicle extending to 746 written soon after that date by the otherwise unknown John son of Samuel and citing an unknown chronicle composed 724-31 (wherein much of the more detailed material was attributable to a source written either within or on the frontier of the Caliphate before 717) (2) was transmitted to Theophanes through the intermediary of a Melchite monk of Palestine writing in Greek c. 780 whose work was brought to Constantinople in 813 after the dissolution of the Syrian monasteries and the dispersal of their personnel, and to Michael the Syrian through Denis of Tellmahré-writing c. 843-6, while the chronicle dated to 724-31 was one of the sources of the monk of Karthamin whose work was written c.785 and continued as the *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* (3). The last notice Theophanes drew from the Melchite continuator of the common source was apparently (780) the persecution of Christians by al-Mahdi (775-85) the first caliph of the Abbasīd jihād [AM 6272, I, p. 452,

(1) P. K. HITT, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

(2) E. W. BROOKS, *The Sicilian Expedition of Constantine IV* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VIII (1899), 455-459).

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *The Sources of Theophanes and the Syriac Chroniclers* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XV (1906), pp. 578-587).

l. 20-p. 453, l. 4, II, p. 299. l. 35-p. 330, l. 14], with further but unidentifiable written or oral evidence providing the Chronographia's coverage of eastern events after this date. It was possible to identify the common source of Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers with one of the sources of the *Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantia-Arabica ad 741*, since Nöldeke followed Mommsen's discovery of an Arab chronicle source which contributed the narrative of events in the East both to this mid-eighth century Spanish work and to the ninth century Byzantine chroniclers⁽¹⁾ by characterising this source as the work of a Monophysite writer living certainly in Syria and possibly in Damascus⁽²⁾, although different aspects of this chronicle were reproduced by Spanish and Syriac writers. Despite this confirmation the basis and application of Brooks' work was soon seen to be insufficiently wide in that the only parallel passages relative to the period of this investigation which he cited were of annalistic format and from the reign of Justinian II, yet there was not only a far greater degree of congruence in a markedly non-annalistic format for the reigns of Constans II and Constantine IV between the narratives of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian beyond the bounds of Denis of Tellmahré than he admitted but also between those of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian and the then-unpublished Elias of Nisibis than he realised, a congruence which in itself made Theophanes' use of a Byzantine source less likely. Accepting Brooks' point that Michael who was lavish in both preface and text with information concerning his sources was unlikely to have drawn upon an uncited work, and admitting the *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* served as the only now-identifiable source for the *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens*, an extension of the common material entailed a partially undocumented amended pattern of totally autonomous transmission of the common source to Michael the Syrian via Ignatius bishop of Metilene (1061-95) who was the author of an obscure chronicle based upon James of Edessa and Denis of Tellmahré for the years 325-1118 and known only to Michael the Syrian, and independently to Denis of Tellmahré and to Elias

(1) Th. MOMMSEN, *Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana*, M.G.H., Auct. Antiq., XI, Berlin, 1894, p. 330.

(2) T. NÖLDEKE, *Epimetrum*, in M.G.H., Auct. Antiq., XI, Berlin, 1894, p. 367.

of Nisibis via Jesudenah metropolitan of Basra at the end of the ninth century whose now non-extant ecclesiastical history was cited as source by Elias in all places where congruence existed. The frequent thematic if not stylistic correspondence which was noted between the presentation of the internal history and external aggression of the Caliphate by Theophanes' *Chronographia* and Elias' bilingual *Chronography* when the latter cited the work of Muḥammad the Khawarizmi (d. 835) has been observed but not here explained, for speculation although intriguing was unproductive as to the existence of a common source between the Arabic and Syriac chroniclers and its relationship to that between the Syriac and Greek chroniclers, a concurrence hinted at in the sources for the Arab invasions of Asia Minor (37) and by no means inherently impossible given the rôle of Christian subjects as translators of Greek or Syrian originals for their Arab masters:

(37) To illuminate the geography and Arab nomenclature of the invaded localities and to provide valuable chronological information in comparison with Greek and Syriac sources, Brooks (1) assembled relevant extracts upon the Arab invasions of Asia Minor from five Arabic sources: from al Baladhuri's (d. 893) *Futūḥ al-Bulḍān* on the territorial conquests, from the *Ta'riḫ* or compendium of universal history of the historian and geographer ibn Wadhich al Yak'kubi written c. 900, from the *Ta'riḫ al-Rusul wa-a-Mulūk* or annals of the apostles and kings of al Tabari (838-923), from the *Kitāb al-Uyūn wa-al-Hadā'iq* or original anthology which although a mid-eleventh century compilation preserved valuable notices of the earlier period, from the *al-Kāmil fi al-Ta'āriḫ* or complete chronicles of ibn al Athir (1160-1234) which in its earlier part was an abridgement incidentally preserving some non-extant notices of al Tabari. In the present study, Arabic sources have received only this limited consideration.

Even if divergencies in occasionally parallel but more often corresponding or related passages of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian were ascribed not so much to differences of aim and tongue between the two chroniclers as to an active rather than a passive rôle for their intermediaries identified as the Melchite monk fl. 780 and the unknown writer of 806 (38), these acknowledged discrepancies at first imparted an artificial aura to the establishment

(1) E. W. BROOKS, *The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-760) from Arabic Sources* (v. *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XVIII (1898), pp. 182-208).

of a single chronicle tradition which extended over the whole of the seventh century and conveyed to Byzantine and to Syriac sources the annals composed 724-31 and their incorporated narrative (presumably the equivalent of a complete chronicle for the years 650-680) of the chronicler post-717 :

(38) A source overlooked by Brooks, a contribution of unknown authorship and scope in its influence upon Michael the Syrian's cited sources (by inference from Michael's discussion of the errors promulgated by the council of Constantinople (680-1) a hundred and twenty-five years previously [XI, 12, II, p. 453, II, ll. 8-11] rather than Chabot's observation that Michael's confused chronology in the description of mid-seventh century events was apparently partly due to the divergent nature of the unidentifiable and undateable sources which he used) ⁽¹⁾ which justified the search for a source additional to Denis of Tellmahré for Michael's more detailed and comprehensive narrative of the years 582-842 ; although had there survived the vast *Annals* utilised by succeeding historians, of which the *Chronicle* was only a fraction, Denis of Tellmahré might be revealed without question as Michael the Syrian's sole source for the centuries under discussion.

Nevertheless this perspective of a single tradition emerged from study of those Syriac sources generally accepted as supplementary to the Byzantine sources for the period ⁽²⁾ to be a feature of this paper in its original form, and moreover was strengthened by subsequent investigations of the tradition's additional common contribution to Agapius of Hierapolis in the tenth century and the anonymous author of the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* in the thirteenth century wherein its original form was more clearly delineated. It is hoped thus to do justice to and to advance Brooks' work, by treating it in a somewhat different light and by taking into account further relevant factors, so as to incorporate its contribution into a larger whole. Furthermore the link traced by Peeters between the account in the eleventh century Georgian translation of the *Vita* of Maximus the Confessor by St. Euthemius the Hagiorite and in Michael the Syrian of the assassination of Constans II in Sicily, which upon examination was further reflected in Agapius and reproduced in greater detail in the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens*,

(1) J.-B. CHABOT, *La Chronique de Michel le Syrien ...*, II, p. 450, n. 2.

(2) Vd. : G. OSTROGORSKY, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, p. 81.

first proved the existence of a source prior to Theophanes and divergent from his Anastasian authority of the Moscow codex and then placed the Georgian *Vita* and thus the Syriac sources closer to the original phraseology of the more detailed prototype; emendation of the variants of household implement found in the above five sources to the assassin's weapon noted in the *Vita* of pope St. Martin I known to St. Euthemius and written c. 730-40 (1), a date for the use of the common prototype which would not appear irreconcilable with that of 724-31 given by Brooks for the compilation of the Syriac annals, suggested a deliberate and realistic correction of the extant earlier official version of Constans' death at a safe distance from the event and at a time of renewed imperial-papal confrontation. However detailed study of this unitary source tradition (39) would require thorough investigation of mediaeval Syriac chronicle literature and was thus beyond the competence of the present writer, who has adopted as a working theory the incorporation for the reign of Constans II (641-668) into a narrative of maintained annalistic format and brevity at least four passages of greater length and detail possibly from a distinct and complete chronicle, which transmitted to both Byzantine and Syriac chroniclers four major episodes in contemporary Byzantine history viz: — the naval action off Phoinike in Lycia (655) (40), the revolt of Saborius Persogenes in Armenia (667) (41), Constans' withdrawal (661) to Syracuse with the revolt of Mezizus following his assassination (668) (42), and the relations between Constantine IV and his brothers (43) which naturally succeeded the previous narrative but appeared in Theophanes in a not altogether happy combination with the renewed Byzantine source tradition for imperial history:

(39) In endeavouring to establish the sources of Theophanes in relation to the Syriac chroniclers it might first be profitable to list those which in their isolation were thus irrelevant to the debate: — the meagre secular and ecclesiastical notices anent Persia until the Moslem conquest of the *Chronicon anonymum*, the now corrupt compilation of the work of previous authors that was the *Chronicon miscellaneum ad 724 pertinens*, and the three chronicles in which Gregory bar-Hebraeus attempted the compilation of universal history partly by availing himself of a multitude of multi-lingual sources already assembled by Michael the Syrian, so that his work marked

(1) P. PEETERS, *op. cit.*

the terminus ad quem of the present study. Sources laid under levy by later writers were of greater interest : — the *Chronicon Maroniticum* which was a source for Agapius and known to Denis of Tellmahré and Michael the Syrian but with lacunae 361-658 and little resemblance to the common notices of Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers, James of Edessa whose chronicle although lost after 631 was a source for Michael the Syrian and thus for Gregory bar-Hebraeus but whose relation to Theophanes was speculation, and the *Chronicon anonymum ad 813 pertinens* which was a source for Michael the Syrian but otherwise of no direct import. Six chroniclers were indebted to the common source tradition also manifested in Theophanes : — the *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Domini 819 pertinens* to which the *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* was closely related although the lacunae of the latter source 610-681 impeded demonstration of the links between the two minor chronicles of Karthamin and those with the main source, Denis of Tellmahré (to maintain the conventional attribution of the *Chronicon*) who was cited by Elias of Nisibis and formed one of the main sources of Michael the Syrian, Elias of Nisibis who knew both Denis and the now non-extant transmission source of the main tradition which they shared, Agapius of Hierapolis if with a language change and apparently free rather than literal reproduction which combined with lacunae 685-705 to hinder the tracing of the common tradition, Michael the Syrian via a lost intermediary of the early ninth century, and the *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* which despite its mutilation can be shown to have used the common tradition with greater detail and at times with greater coherence than either Theophanes or Michael the Syrian.

(40) Preceded by the destruction of Mu'āwiyah's fleet at Tripolis in Phoenicia by the captive sons of a Byzantine trumpeter [AM 6146, I, p. 345, ll. 16-25, II, p. 216, l. 31-p. 217, l. 6] (cf. : parallel accounts in Michael the Syrian [XI, 11, II, p. 445, ll. 17-24] and Elias of Nisibis [p. 67, ll. 12-8]) which failed to halt the Arab offensive so that the next year saw the battle in which Constans would have lost his life but for the self-sacrifice of the ubiquitous and heroic son of the trumpeter [AM 6146, I, p. 345, l. 25-p. 346, l. 18, II, p. 217, ll. 7-30] (again reproduced exactly by Michael the Syrian [XI, 11, II, p. 445, l. 25-p. 446, l. 6] but not by Elias, with a similar tradition but another annalistic framework evident in the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxiv, p. 214, ll. 5-34], while Agapius gave only the bare mention of the location and the imperial defeat [p. 224, ll. 7-8]) ; although Ostrogorsky's comment that the account contained elements of an historical epic⁽¹⁾ was valid it was unfortuna-

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

tely without further identification, while the non-Byzantine links were so clear that it might be conjectured that the annalistic brevity of the *Continuatio Byzantia - Arabica et Hispana* [p. 343, I, l. 31-p. 344, I, l. 3, p. 344, II, ll. 1-4] represented the original notice of the Syriac chronicle source.

(41) A province where religious and political turbulence (pro- and antichalcedonian, pro- and anti-Byzantine) had been rife for a century ⁽¹⁾, where the civil war within the Caliphate from 659 had earlier allowed the leading families to revoke the pro-Arab alignment following upon Mu'āwiyah's further conquests of 642-43 and to renew relations with Byzantium ⁽²⁾, and where the revolt of 667 according to Pertusi resulted in the establishment of the Armenian theme composed of frontier fragments of the former province ⁽³⁾; this was not apparent from the narrative of the chroniclers, where it was the prominence given to the arbitration of Mu'āwiyah between the envoys of the secessionist Saborius and Constantine the emperor's son in the notices of the Armenian revolt and subsequent Byzantine and Arab military activity [AM 6159, I, p. 348, l. 29-p. 350, l. 27, II, p. 219, l. 23-p. 221, l. 10] (reproduced by Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 451, I, l. 25-p. 454, l. 22] although without its denouement of the first Arab raid to Chalcedon, recté Constantinople ⁽⁴⁾, cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 70, ll. 4-5] and also ibn Wadhich, al Tabari, ibn al Athir [p. 185, ll. 31-5, p. 186, ll. 6-8, 18-20]) [AM 6159, I, p. 350, l. 27-p. 351, l. 5, II, p. 221, ll. 11-17], which led Brooks not only to his identification of its author with the chronicler post-717 but also to his use of the confused nomenclature of the rebel (ie. Michael the Syrian's Shabur Aprast'igan = Theophanes' correct Persogenes) to postulate Theophanes' direct use of a Greek version of the common source ⁽⁵⁾; but aside from the undesirable complexity and proliferation of source tradition thus invoked, Peeters was later able to establish that Michael the Syrian in reproducing the deformed version of the Armenian name Pasagnathes was in fact confusing Saborius with the commander given in the common source for the earlier revolt of 653-4 which he himself omitted ⁽⁶⁾, wherein Theophanes achieved both the wrong date and the wrong name [AM 6134,

(1) P. J. ALEXANDER, *An ascetic sect of Iconoclasts in seventh century Armenia*, in *Studies in Honor of A.M. Friend*, Princeton, 1955, pp. 151-160.

(2) H. MANANDEAN, *op. cit.*

(3) A. PERTUSI, *La formation des Thèmes byzantins* (v. *Berichte zum XI. internationalen Byzantinisten Kongress*, München, 1958, pp. 150-163.

(4) P. K. HITTI, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

(5) E. W. BROOKS, *The Sicilian Expedition of Constantine IV* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VII (1908), pp. 445-459).

(6) P. PEETERS, *Pasagnathes-Persogenes* (v. *Byzantion*, VIII (1933), pp. 84-87).

I, p. 344, ll. 26-9, II, p. 216, ll. 16-9] for the commander was Theodore Rstuni and Pasagnathes (if he existed — there was no mention in Sebeos) was only a subordinate; Agapius noted the earlier revolt [p. 222, ll. 4-10] and the imperial repression of the second with Yazīd's presence at Chalcedon [p. 228, l. 16-p. 229, l. 15] although the revolt of Saborius was illegible in the codex, while the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxviii, p. 220, l. 19-p. 223, l. 18] corresponded to Theophanes' version of the common source.

(42) Although the correspondence between Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers anent the events prior to Constans' withdrawal from Constantinople [AM 6160, I, p. 351, ll. 16-7, 24, II, p. 221, ll. 25-6, 33; AM 6153, I, p. 348, ll. 4-8, II, p. 218, l. 36-p. 219, l. 4] was one of content rather than style; the murder of his brother Theodosius to safeguard his children's succession (660) [AM 6160, I, p. 351, l. 15, II, p. 221, ll. 22-4; AM 6151, I, p. 347, l. 25, II, p. 218, ll. 24-6] (cf.: Elias of Nisibis [p. 68, ll. 14-6], Michael the Syrian [XI, 11, II, p. 446, ll. 28-9], with limited links to the *Chronicon Maroniticum* [p. 55, ll. 15-20]), his measures against pope Martin (659/60 = AM 6150, according to Theophanes, but according to the *Vita Martin* was arrested at Rome (June 653) [p. 255, l. 5-p. 257, l. 30], arrived at Constantinople (Sept. 653) and was tried (Dec. 653) [p. 257, l. 21-p. 261, l. 3], then was exiled to Cherson (April/May 654) [p. 261, ll. 4-23] where he died possibly (Sept. 654) or more probably (April 655) [p. 261, l. 24-p. 262, l. 6]), Maximus the Confessor and Anastasius (658-9) to enforce Monotheletism [AM 6160, I, p. 351, ll. 17-21, II, p. 221, ll. 26-33; AM 6150, I, p. 347, ll. 21-3, II, p. 218, ll. 21-3; AM 6149, I, p. 347, ll. 7-14, II, p. 218, ll. 10-7], and Constans' frustrated attempt (662) to bring his family to Syracuse [AM 6160, I, p. 351, ll. 24-8, II, p. 221, l. 33-p. 222, l. 2; AM 6153, I, p. 348, ll. 8-12, II, p. 218, l. 35-p. 219, l. 4] (cf.: Agapius [p. 230, ll. 1-11], Michael the Syrian [XI, 11, II, p. 446, ll. 16-8, p. 447, II, ll. 7-12] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxvii, p. 219, l. 32-p. 220, l. 7]); the problem of whether, following the murder of Constans in Syracuse, Constantine IV suppressed in person the revolt of Mezizus the Armenian comes obsequii in Sicily was one of the most complex of Byzantine historiography, not least because of the paucity of primary sources, although its resolution in the negative by Brooks⁽¹⁾ (accepted explicitly by Ostrogorsky⁽²⁾ implicitly by Vasiliev⁽³⁾) despite Grégoire's attempt to establish the version of Theophanes⁽⁴⁾ was here

(1) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

(2) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

(3) A. A. VASILIEV, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison 1961, p. 212.

(4) H. GRÉGOIRE, *Notules épigraphiques* (v. *Byzantion*, XIII (1938), p. 170).

equalled in interest by the source congruence, that although the more comprehensive and accurate account of Constans' sojourn in the West and the suppression of the revolt by the Italian exarch without either knowledge of or assistance from the East was found in the near contemporary notice of the *Liber Pontificalis* [I, p. 343, l. 6-p. 344, l. 8, p. 364, ll. 5-10] (if with minor inaccuracies) while Theophanes [AM 6160, I, p. 351, l. 28-p. 352, l. 7, II, p. 222, ll. 9-12] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 450, l. 34-p. 451, l. 10] with unimportant although not uninteresting variations reproduced from their common source the former erroneous account (cf. : Agapius [p. 230, l. 11-p. 231, l. 7] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxix, p. 223, l. 23-p. 224, l. 4] ; in this instance again, Brooks' work has only been corrected in its details by Grierson⁽¹⁾ concerning the confusion between the precise dates of the death of Constans (July) and the accession (or start of the regnal year) of Constantine IV (Sept.-Nov. 668), and acceptance of Cedrenus' unsupported and erroneous statement that Constans was buried at Constantinople⁽²⁾, and the false transfer of Constans II's nickname of Pogonatus to Constantine IV⁽³⁾).

(43) Since Paul the Deacon, following and amplifying the *Liber Pontificalis* almost a century later, further stated upon the authority of Bede of Jarrow that Constantine son of Constans therefore succeeded to the Empire and ruled for seventeen years [V, 30, p. 154, ll. 11-13] as did the *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* (the former with slightly more detail) [p. 344, I, ll. 22-31, p. 345, II, ll. 8-13] but both Theophanes and Michael the Syrian stated that Constantine IV on his return to Constantinople from Syracuse ruled with his brothers Tiberius and Heraclius [AM 6160, I, p. 352, ll. 7-9, II, p. 222, ll. 12-4] (cf. : Agapius [p. 231, ll. 7-9], Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 451, ll. 7-10] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxx, p. 224, ll. 5-11]) ; Theophanes narrated the revolt of the Anatolic theme (669) which produced the brothers' mutilation instead of their coronation [AM 6161, I, p. 352, ll. 12-24, II, p. 222, ll. 16-25] before their ultimate deposition (681) [AM 6173, I, p. 360, ll. 18-20, II, p. 228, ll. 13-5], Michael the Syrian narrated the proclamation of the three autocrats after Constans' departure for Sicily [XI, 11, II, p. 446, ll. 25-9] and the brothers' joint proclamation by Constantine (668) before their deposition (681) [XI, 13, II, p. 454, ll. 30-5, p. 455, l. 12-p. 456, l. 13] (cf. : Agapius [p. 244, ll. 3-8] with a bare mention but *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxii, p. 225, ll. 3-30]

(1) P. GRIERSON, *op. cit.*

(2) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *Who was Constantine Pogonatus?* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XVII (1908), pp. 460-462).

with full detail), while James of Edessa noted the accession of Constantine and his brothers for sixteen years [p. 253, 11, ll. 15-7] and Elias of Nisibis' catalogue of emperors tabulated the death of Constantine after a twenty-seven year reign (668) and then the conclusion of nine years' joint rule by his three sons (671) and the death of Constantine after a seven year period of sole rule (684) [p. 25, ll. 7-9]; in this instance there was no parallel reproduction in Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers for as Brooks made clear Theophanes' confusion (individually the notice of AM 6161 was wrong, and combined with that of AM 6173 mutually contradictory) arose from his combination of both western or Byzantine and eastern sources, so that he separated the concomitant processes of mutilation and deposition by attributing the former together with the misplaced Anatolic revolt from the western source to 669 but correctly retaining the deposition for the assurance of the future Justinian II's succession to 680-1 (not his association, which came only in 685) (1).

Evaluation of the narratives of Michael the Syrian's *Chronicle* and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* not only suggested that the legacy of the chronicler post-717 to the annalist of 724-31 and thence to the chronicler post-746 contained further notices of the Arabs' Mediterranean conquests and the Caliphate's civil war in mid-seventh century (which will be considered in their turn below) abbreviated either by Theophanes or his intermediary, but also indicated the altered nature of this common source by the significant change in the character of their notices (and in those of Agapius) of the emperors of Constantinople from c. 680 to the end of the Heraclian era and simultaneously emphasised their lack of congruence with Theophanes. The limited rôle in and perhaps the tenuous connection with this investigation of the Latin sources cited (44) has been made apparent:

(44) Which may be grouped under two potential source-derivations According to Nöldeke an eighth century Syriac chronicle emerged in Theophanes and Nicephorus and additionally in the *Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantina-Arabica ad 741* and in the *Continuatio Isidoriana Hispana ad 754* (2), the former of these anonymous Spanish chronicles written in mid-eighth century from an Arab chronicle source originating outside Spain and from Isidore's texts and from

(1) E. W. BROOKS, *The Brothers of the Emperor Constantine IV* (v. Engl. Hist. Rev., XXX (1915), pp. 42-44).

(2) Th. NÖLDEKE, *op. cit.*

latercula of eastern emperors to show some correspondence with narratives of Arab history found in ninth century Byzantine chroniclers, and the latter constituting in a sense the final recension of Isidore's *Historia* and the *Byzantia-Arabica* to add the history of Spain to that of Constantinople and the Arab world. The personal historical works of Isidore bishop of Seville (*Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueborum a. 624*, *Chronica Maiora a. 615*, *Chronicarum Epitome a. 627*) were not relevant to this investigation. Although reference has been made above to points of resemblance between the texts of the *Continuatio Isidoriana* and those of Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers, it must be stated that Nicephorus had no links with Syriac sources, and the problem of the identification of sources must be illustrated (for instance) by the *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana*'s attribution of the recovery of Egypt, Syria, Arabia, Judaea and Mesopotamia to Nicetas on his march from Africa to Constantinople in prelude of a generalised account of Heraclius' Persian campaigns [p. 335, ll. 12-8, 21-32, p. 336, ll. 14-22; p. 335, II, ll. 12-6, p. 335, II, l. 21-p. 336, II, l. 22], or alternatively by the *Continuatio Hispana*'s somewhat allegorical recital of the single combat between Heraclius and Rizates [p. 335, II, l. 30-p. 336, II, l. 13] drawn possibly from Fredegar [IV, 64, p. 152, l. 8-p. 153, l. 3] or from the above non-extant source or from neither. Since Byzantine history was at all times incidental to the main narrative, Fredegar played a minor rôle in this study, and hence the complex problems surrounding his text have been ignored. Mommsen but not Waitz suggested a lost annalistic source of eighth century Byzantine Italy, connected with the consular fasti of Ravenna and Constantinople to provide occasional notices of events in the East and imperial latercula for use by western chroniclers, as a link between Theophanes and Nicephorus on the one hand and the independently utilised common source of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Historia Langobardorum* on the other⁽¹⁾. Few of the notices of the *Liber Pontificalis* for the seventh century, those most relevant for this study, were by the same hand but were concise and reduced to the narration of events, with natural phenomena accorded almost equal importance to political revolutions and with little obvious link with consular lists, so that it was the *Vita* of Gregory II (715-31), among the more detailed eighth century notices which preceded the ninth century revision of Anastasius the bibliothecarius, in which the above common source was deemed especially to be found. In composition of his second major historical work, the *Historia Langobardorum* which treated the history of his own people from mid-

(1) (i) Th. MOMMSEN (ii) G. WAITZ, *Die Quellen der Langobardengeschichte des Paulus Diaconus* (v. *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, V (1879), pp. 207-229).

sixth to mid-eighth century, Paul the Deacon where appropriate included notices from Frankish and Byzantine history which derived from classical and ecclesiastical writers, in addition to Frankish, Lombard and Roman historical sources; but among those notices for which there was no apparent precedent in Paul's extant sources (Isidore of Seville, Bede of Jarrow, *Liber Pontificalis*, Lombard sources) were the not wholly accurate statements of the accession of Phocas, the revolt of Heraclius, the confused succession of 641 [IV, 36, p. 128, ll. 9-10; IV, 36, p. 128, ll. 16-23; IV, 49, p. 136, l. 28-p. 137, l. 4]. However, since the corroborative testimony of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Historia Langobardorum* has here been invoked only in the instances of the circumstances surrounding the suppression of the revolt of Mezizus in Sicily and the subsequent relations of Constantine IV and his brothers, the question as to whether Paul the Deacon's principal source was provided by Byzantino-Italian annals or by the *Liber Pontificalis* and Bede has not been resolved.

The short year to year notes which were the basic format of the Greek-Syriac chronicle served as Theophanes' source for his notices of revolts against Constans in the provinces of the Empire (45), for his narrative of the internal history of the Caliphate (46) and of the Arab advance against the Empire (47) in the reign of Constans II, for his brief notice of Constans' victorious campaign against Sclavinia (48), and for his sometimes imprecise notices of the natural phenomena (49) which occurred during the reign:

(45) Of the revolt of the patrician Valentinian (644) [AM 6136, I, p. 343, ll. 2-6, II, p. 215, ll. 6-8] (cf. : *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxvi, p. 203, ll. 30-2]) although only Sebeos with a wealth of not always convincing detail agreed upon his fate [ch. 32, p. 105, l. 6-p. 106, l. 12], but John of Nikiu gave the terms upon which Valentinian was forced to renew his allegiance before participating in the unsuccessful Byzantine offensive to regain Alexandria [ch. 120, p. 462, ll. 5-14, p. 463, ll. 5-9] and Valentinian's military command was partially confirmed by Denis of Tellmahré's notice that in the same year he fled before an Arab army [p. 6, l. 13-p. 7, l. 2], while according to Michael the Syrian he finally fell in battle against the Arabs in Armenia [XI, 10, II, p. 443, I, ll. 5-14] although this last account of the campaign with the Armenian David prince of the Saharhoui against the Arabs in Mesopotamia [XI, 10, 11, p. 443, I, l. 5-p. 444, I, l. 35] was less coherent than that of the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxiii, p. 201, l. 9-p. 202, l. 8]; (it might here be noted that it was Sebeos who provided the fullest account of the revolt of Valentinian Arsacidus, commander of the army of the East under Constantine III and virtual if uncrowned co-emperor with Constans II, but with a striking lack of local knowledge of the

topography of Constantinople and from a use of personal eyewitness and unidentified Armenian sources, and in the Armenian tongue, which made any direct connection with Byzantine or Syriac traditions highly improbable); of Gregory the orthodox exarch of Africa whose bid for the imperial throne was ended by his death in battle against the invading 'Abdullāh (647-8) [AM 6138, I, p. 343, ll. 14-6, 24-8, II, p. 215, ll. 15-7, 22-5], although Michael the Syrian who confirmed the revolt and the Arab invasions wrongly concluded that Gregory submitted to Constans (647) [XI 10, II, p. 440, l. 32-p. 441, l. 3] (cf. : Agapius [p. 219, ll. 10-11, 15-8] and *Chronicon... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxvi, p. 203, l. 33-p. 204, l. 2]) and the *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* noted Gregory's death without the preceeding revolt [p. 334, I, ll. 13-8, II, ll. 5-21]; of the Armenian rejection of Byzantine suzerainty and temporary submission to Arab allegiance (652) [AM 6143, I, p. 344, ll. 26-9, II, p. 216, ll. 16-20], a notice omitted by Michael the Syrian but amplified and corrected by Sebeos [ch. 35, p. 132, l. 21-p. 143, l. 11].

(46) Viz. : (643) the initial difficulties encountered in erecting 'Umar's mosque at Jerusalem [AM 6135, I, p. 342, ll. 22-8, II, p. 214, l. 34-p. 215, l. 5] (slightly extended but corresponding to Michael the Syrian [XI, 8, II, p. 431, I, ll. 24-7] but with less detail from the common tradition in the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxvi, p. 204, ll. 6-11]), the murder of 'Umar and the succession of 'Uthman (Nov. 644 according to the eastern sources but 645 according to Theophanes' corrected reckoning) [AM 6137, I, p. 343, ll. 8-12, II, p. 215, ll. 10-4]; there was no correspondence between accounts of the civil war in the Caliphate (656-61) [AM 6147, 6148, 6150, 6151, 6152, I, p. 346, l. 27-p. 347, l. 14, p. 347, ll. 16-20, 27-8, p. 347, l. 30-p. 348, l. 2, II, p. 218, ll. 3-8, 18-20, 27-8, 29-35], although James of Edessa [p. 252, II, l. 14-p. 253, II, l. 8], the *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* more briefly [p. 343, I, ll. 26-30, p. 343, II, l. 26-p. 344, II, l. 1] and Denis of Tellmahré [p. 9, ll. 7-11] noted the conflict preceeding Mu'āwiyah's sole rule, as did Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 449, l. 27-p. 450, l. 20] and the very detailed and accurate *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxv-cxxxvi, p. 214, l. 35-p. 219, l. 31] suggesting an affinity with the interpolated chronicle rather than its annalistic format but without showing correspondence with Theophanes.

(47) Which in some instances again may be traced in Denis of Tellmahré but more frequently in Michael the Syrian, with a wealth of local knowledge revealed in detail upon Syria but with blank ignorance of the targets of annal Arab incursions into imperial territory further afield, with (648) the occupation of the Pentapolis preceeding the invasion of North Africa and sack of Sufetula (capital of the seditious and defeated exarch Gregory) and tribute from the province by the Arabs of Egypt under 'Abdullāh [AM 6139, I, p. 343, ll. 24-8, II, p. 215, ll. 22-5] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 10, II, p. 440,

l. 35-p. 441, l. 3]), the conquest of Cyprus (649) by Mu'āwiyah governor of Syria with even greater detail (suggestive again of an affinity with the interpolated chronicle rather than its annalistic framework) on the reduction of the island of Rwad off the Syrian coast which was not completed until the following year (649-50) [AM 6140-1, I, p. 343, l. 30-p. 344, l. 15, I, p. 215, l. 26-p. 216, l. 3] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 10, II, p. 441, l. 34-p. 442, l. 17, p. 443, ll. 23-7] for a substantially similar account, and Agapius [p. 220, l. 9-p. 221, l. 5] with spelling «Aroud» cf. : Theophanes' «Arados», but Denis of Tellmahré [p. 7, ll. 15-6] for a brief notice ; the nature of his sources did not permit Theophanes to mention significant fundamental changes in Syria before the Arab conquests — the replacement of Greek by the ancient lingua-franca of Syriac even in the towns, the replacement of city life by village life with its multiplicity of monasteries and small-holdings⁽¹⁾ ; the successive Arab plundering raids into Asia Minor although relatively well documented in Muslim sources were treated more systematically by Elias of Nisibis than by Theophanes, an omission which was surprising in view of their fundamental importance as a factor in the political and demographical transition from classical to mediaeval Asia Minor despite the ultimate failure of the Arabs to advance beyond their long line of fortifications from Melitene by the Upper Euphrates to Tarsus near the Mediterranean, a process inaugurated (651) by the invasion of Isauria under Busr which led Constans to sue for peace and to allow as Mu'āwiyah's hostage the Heraclian Gregory whose embalmed body was to be brought back to Constantinople for burial after his death in captivity at Heliopolis (653) [AM 6142, 6144, I, p. 344, ll. 19-24, p. 345, ll. 1-5, II, p. 216, ll. 12-6 (Gregory's death omitted by Anastasius)] (cf. : Agapius [p. 212, l. 20-p. 222, l. 3] for negotiations rather than hostages, and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxiii, p. 213, l. 34-p. 214, l. 4]) while Ostrogorsky amended the period of truce to three years⁽²⁾, resumed (663) by the united Caliphate [AM 6154, I, p. 348, ll. 10-1, II, p. 219, ll. 5-6] while the Arab fleet invaded Sicily [AM 6155, I, p. 348, ll. 13-4, II, p. 219, ll. 7-8] and (665) 'Abderrahman son of Khalid not only ravaged several provinces of Asia Minor but wintered there [AM 6156, I, p. 348, ll. 16-8, II, p. 219, ll. 9-11] (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 69, ll. 5-6], ibn Wadhich and al Tabari [p. 184, ll. 28-32]) before returning to Syria to resettle there a Slav detachment brought to Asia Minor by Constans (658) after his Balkan campaign [AM 6156, I, p. 348, ll. 18-20, II, p. 219, ll. 11-14], (666) saw Busr's fresh invasion of Asia Minor (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 68, ll. 35-8], ibn Wadhich and al Tabari [p. 184, ll. 22-6]) and the deaths

(1) G. TCHALENKO, *La Syrie du Nord ; étude économique* (v. *Actes du VI^e Congrès international des études byzantines* (Paris, 1950), II, pp. 389-397).

(2) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

of the bishops of Apameia and Edessa [AM 6157, I, p. 348, ll. 22-4, II, p. 219, ll. 17-8] (the latter notice epitomising the nature of Theophanes' source material), (667) Bsur and Faḍālah made a joint incursion around Hexapolis [AM 6158, I, p. 348, ll. 26-7, II, p. 219, ll. 19-22] and (668) Mu'āwiyah launched an offensive in support of the revolt of the Armenian Saborius Persogenes which resulted in Faḍālah's temporary occupation of Amorium in Phrygia and Yazid's advance to Chalcedon [AM 6159, I, p. 350, l. 27-p. 351, l. 11, II, p. 221, ll. 10-7] (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 69, l. 29, p. 70, ll. 4-5], ibn Wadhich, al Tabari, ibn al Athir [p. 185, ll. 31-5, p. 186, ll. 6-8, 18-20]) ; some of Theophanes' notices were less detailed than those of Michael the Syrian or the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* which in its turn was still more detailed, viz : that of (654) the temporary occupation and pillage of Rhodes with the destruction of its Colossus [AM 6145, I, p. 345, ll. 8-11, II, p. 216, ll. 24-6] (cf. : Agapius [p. 222, ll. 12-7], those anent Cyprus and Rwad in *Chronicon ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxī, p. 209, l. 19-p. 211, l. 26 ; cxxxii, p. 211, l. 27-p. 213, l. 19] preceeded according to Michael the Syrian by the capture of Cos and pillage of Crete [XI, 10, II, p. 442, l. 28-p. 443, l. 3], while the victorious Arab campaign in Armenia in the same year [AM 6145, I, p. 345, ll. 11-14, II, p. 216, ll. 28-9] and Mu'āwiyah's capture of Caesarea in Cappaodocia (655) [AM 6146, I, p. 345, ll. 26-7, II, p. 216, ll. 18-9] were both reported by Michael the Syrian with more detail but without date [XI, 10, II, p. 441, ll. 5-7 ; XI, II, p. 441, ll. 13-32].

(48) When he seized the opportunity afforded by the civil war in the Caliphate to launch the first Byzantine offensive against the Slavs since that of the last decade of the reign of Maurice [AM 6149, I, p. 347, ll. 6-7, II, p. 218, ll. 9-11] (reproduced by Elias of Nisibis [p. 68, ll. 12-15] but not by Michael the Syrian) but although Theophanes could later note the Slav secession to 'Abdarrāḥman [AM 6156, I, p. 348, ll. 18-20, II, p. 219, ll. 11-14] he was presumably unaware of their original resettlement by Constans or else was unwilling to give the policy of the heretic emperor its due recognition.

(49) Viz. : (Dec. 645) an eclipse of the sun [AM 6136, I, p. 343, ll. 5-6 (omitted by Anastasius)] rightly dated (Nov. 645) by Agapius [p. 219, ll. 1-2] (the chroniclers' dating of the eclipses was confused, for total eclipses are recorded for Nov. 644, thus here and in the instance of the Palestinian earthquake of 632 amendment of Theophanes' chronology conflicted with scientific calculation, and for April 646), (648) a violent storm and great wind [AM 6139, I, p. 345, ll. 22-4, II, p. 215, ll. 19-21] (cf. : Agapius [p. 220, ll. 1-3], Michael the Syrian [XI, 10, II, p. 445, ll. 1-2], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxvi, p. 204, ll. 3-5]), (653) a fearful rain of ashes from heaven (recte meteoric display? the term could indicate an aurora, a volcano, a whirlwind, or even the shooting star noted in China in the same year) [AM 6144, I, p. 345, ll. 2-4, II, p. 216, ll. 20-2], (June 659) a great destructive earthquake in Palestine and Syria [AM 6150, I, p. 347, ll. 19-20 (omitted by Anastasius)] (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 68,

ll. 18-9]), (664) a solar eclipse mentioned solely by the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxviii, p. 220, l. 11] thereby posing a problem in source-transmission since this Syriac observation was presumably not original as the solar eclipse of May 664 was visible in N.W. Europe only as the sun had set at Constantinople, (665) a harsh winter was noted only by the *Chronicon ad 819) pertinens* [p. 8, ll. 18-9] (winter 667) a great flood accompanied by much loss of life and a comet in the sky at Edessa [AM 6159, I, p. 351, ll. 9-11 (omitted by Anastasius)] (cf. : Agapius [p. 229, ll. 16-9], Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 451, I, 11, 19-20], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxviii, p. 223, ll. 19-22] with more detail of the flood but without the comet, which was unlisted by Grumel (*) although there was a Chinese record possibly involving dittography of a comet May 667 and May-June 668.

The prominence accorded to the conjectural reconstruction of Theophanes' Greek Syriac chronicle source for the three decades of the mid-seventh century was in proportion to its contribution to Theophanes' history of the era, but for the reigns of the last two Heraclians (Constantine IV Pogonatus : 668-85, and Justinian II Rhinotmetus : 685-95, 705-11) when it was no longer Theophanes' sole source nor so wide-ranging in its own scope its rôle was more limited, so that for the reign of Constantine IV the eastern world chronicle provided Theophanes' source for the Arab advance against the Empire (50) (with the exception of the great seven-year assault upon Constantinople) and the internal history of the Caliphate (51) and for observations upon the natural phenomena (52) which occurred during the reign, topics of which Nicephorus using only the Byzantine common-source chronicle (to be characterised in its turn below) inevitably made no mention, and which George the Monk did not reproduce from Theophanes :

(50) Wherein (670) saw an Arab expedition against Byzantine Africa for plunder and prisoners [AM 6161, I, p. 352, ll. 13-14, II, p. 222, ll. 14-6] (cf. : Agapius [p. 231, ll. 10-11] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 450, l. 40]), (671) a severe winter during which Faḍālah wintered in the previously occupied peninsula of Cyzicus [AM 6162, I, p. 353, ll. 6-7, II, p. 222, ll. 26-8] (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 70, l. 3] and al Tabari [p. 186, l. 32]), (672) a further raid by Busr into Asia Minor [AM 6163, I, p. 353, ll. 9-10, II, p. 222, ll. 29-30] (cf. : al Tabari [p. 186, l. 32]), (673-4) when one Arab fleet captured and wintered at

(3) V. GRUMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 471.

Smyrna, a second occupied the coasts of Lycia and Cilicia and a third was dispatched in support of the impending assault upon Constantinople [AM 6164, I, p. 353, ll. 14-9, II, p. 222, l. 34-p. 223, l. 2] (cf. : al Tabari [p. 187, ll. 6-8]) was given only an undated notice upon Lycia and Cilicia by Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 445, ll. 1-3] and the wintering of the Arab force in Crete ignored [vd. : AM 6166, I, p. 354, ll. 20-1, II, p. 223, ll. 22-3] (cf. : Elias of Nisibis [p. 70, l. 21], Agapius [p. 237, ll. 14-5] and al Tabari [p. 188, ll. 6-8]), but Theophanes' notice (678) of the defeat of the Arab army in Asia Minor [AM 6165, I, p. 354, ll. 11-13, II, p. 223 ll. 24-6] can be supplied with its geographical location by Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 445, ll. 1-5] (cf. Agapius [p. 232, ll. 5-11]) ; while (678) the arrival of the Mardiates (a tribe of Christian guerilla fighters of Byzantine allegiance) in the Lebanon and their threat to the Arabs of Syria was noted by Theophanes [AM 6169, I, p. 355, ll. 6-10, II, p. 224, ll. 4-7] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 455, ll. 10-7] as well as by Agapius [p. 232, l. 14-p. 233, l. 3] and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxi, p. 224, ll. 20-4].

(51) With (April 680) Mu'āwiyah's death and his son Yazīd's three year reign being noted by Theophanes [AM 6171, I, p. 356, ll. 15-7, II, p. 225, ll. 6-9] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 468, ll. 27-30], but the revolt of Muhktārah in Persia (682) and the struggle for succession from Yazīd's death at Damascus (Nov. 683) to 'Abd-al-Malik's accession (Sept. 685) according to eastern sources (Theophanes' antedating of this by a year involved the extension of 'Abd-al-Malik's reign and resulted from his omission of the month's reign of Mu'āwiyah II (683) and subsequent interregnum between Yazīd I and Marwān I) were treated in more detail by Michael the Syrian [AM 6174-5, I, p. 360, ll. 22-4, p. 360, l. 27-p. 361, l. 3, II, p. 228, ll. 19-28 ; cf. : IX, 15, II, p. 468, l. 37-p. 469, l. 32] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxii, p. 224, l. 33-p. 225, l. 3 ; cxxxxiii, p. 225, l. 31-p. 226, l. 11 ; cxxxxiiii, p. 226, l. 12-p. 227, l. 9 ; cxxxxv, p. 227, ll. 10-7] ; (685) 'Abd-al-Malik on his accession was forced to sue for peace [AM 6176, I, p. 361, ll. 7-13, II, p. 228, l. 29-p. 229, l. 2] but unlike Agapius [p. 237, ll. 6, 9-15] and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxv, p. 227, ll. 10-7 ; cxxxxvi, p. 227, ll. 22-30] Michael the Syrian was either unaware of these negotiations or else confused them with the later truce between 'Abd-al-Malik and Justinian II [AM 6178, I, p. 363, ll. 6-20, II, p. 230, ll. 15-28] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 469, ll. 20-30] where the entry, as was that of the *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* [p. 175, ll. 30-2], was undated, unlike those of the *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* [p. 8, ll. 30-3], al Tabari [p. 189, ll. 22-4] and al Baladhuri [p. 203, ll. 11-16] but without congruence), while if the *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana's* account of the civil war contained divergencies the peace terms corresponded exactly to those detailed by Theophanes [p. 345, I, l. 14-p. 347, II, l. 13, p. 345, II, l. 14-p. 346, II, l. 20].

(52) Viz. : (671) a harsh winter (Theophanes [AM 6162, I, p. 353, ll. 6-7, II, p. 222, ll. 26-7]) in Syria and Mesopotamia (Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 456, I, ll. 20-4]) the date of which cannot be precisely determined since Irish annals contained a similar notice for 670 in possible reference to the same phenomenon although 671 harmonised with indirect references in Aethelward and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, (673), a great plague in Egypt and in March an apocalyptic (re vera, auroral?) arc in the sky (Theophanes [AM 6164, I, p. 353, ll. 16, 12-3, II, p. 223, l. 2, p. 222, ll. 31-33] at night (Agapius [p. 232, ll. 3-4, p. 231, ll. 16-9], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxxi, p. 224, ll. 16-9] and Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 456, I, ll. 24-8, 32-9]), although the latter dated to Dec. 672 an eclipse of the sun which did not occur (probably by confusion with that of Dec. 676) and the former portent to 678), (676) a comet correctly dated by Theophanes [AM 6167, I, p. 354, l. 23, II, p. 223, ll. 34-5] in refutation of (Aug-Oct. 677) the dating for a terrible comet visible for sixty days by Elias of Nisibis [p. 70, ll. 25-6], and Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 456, I, ll. 29-31], and Agapius [p. 232, ll. 12-3, p. 237, ll. 4-5], (677) a great plague of locusts in Syria and Mesopotamia (Theophanes [AM 6168, I, p. 354, ll. 26-7, II, p. 224, ll. 3-4]) infested by rats the previous year (Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 457, I, ll. 4-5], cf. : Agapius [p. 232, ll. 12-3, p. 237, ll. 4-5]) ; Brooks cited as evidence of a common source the interlocking notices (679) of Mu'āwiyah's reconstruction of the church at Edessa after a great earthquake in Mesopotamia (Theophanes [AM 6170, I, p. 356, ll. 11-13, II, p. 225, ll. 3-5], Michael the Syrian [XI, 13, II, p. 457, I, ll. 9-11], Denis of Tellmahré [p. 9, ll. 19-22], *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* [p. 175, ll. 21-4], the last three dating it to Easter⁽¹⁾ as did the *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* [p. 8, ll. 20-3], Agapius [p. 233, ll. 3-8] if not otherwise close, and the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxxi, p. 224, ll. 25-8]) ; but (685) the notice of a great famine and plague in Syria was Theophanes' alone [AM 6176, p. 361, l. 7, II, p. 228, ll. 29-30].

For the reign of Justinian II Theophanes, although he occasionally supplemented the eastern world chronicle by the Byzantine chronicle which he had as common source with Nicephorus for Byzantino-Arab relations (53), relied upon this Greek Syriac source exclusively for the internal history of the Caliphate (54) and for the not always accurate notices of the natural phenomena (55) occurring throughout the reign :

(53) Justinian, (687) failing to violate with impunity the recently

(1) E. W. Brooks, *The Sources of Theophanes and the Syriac Chroniclers* (v. Byz. Zeitschr., XV (1906), pp. 578-587).

negotiated treaty with 'Abd-al-Malik [AM 6178, I, p. 363, ll. 6-20, II, p. 230, ll. 15-28] by a military expedition against Armenia and Iberia [AM 6178, I, p. 363, ll. 26-32, II, p. 231, ll. 1-7] the following year carried out the agreed (if strategically debatable⁽¹⁾) transfer of the Mardaites from Lebanon [AM 6179, I, p. 364, ll. 3-5, II, p. 231, ll. 10-12] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 469, ll. 18-27]), but (692) further provoked war by largescale resettlement of the population of Cyprus in Cyzicus⁽²⁾ and rejection of the unfamiliar coin of the tribute [AM 6183, I, p. 365, ll. 8-18, II, p. 232, ll. 4-10] only (693) to be defeated due to the Slav defection at Sebastopolis in Armenia [AM 6184, I, p. 366, ll. 6-23, II, p. 232, l. 31-p. 233, l. 10] (cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 470, ll. 4-11], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cl, p. 230, ll. 28-38], and from the Byzantine source Nicephorus [p. 36, l. 30-p. 37, l. 10]) ; (694) the consequent Byzantine surrender of Armenia and defeat in Khurasan [AM 6185, I, p. 366, l. 25-p. 367, l. 2, II, p. 233, ll. 11-17] (cf. : *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cl, p. 231, ll. 1-3]), (694-5) Muḥammad's raid with Slav support and invasion of fourth Armenia [AM 6186-7, I, p. 367, ll. 9-12, p. 368, ll. 13-4, II, p. 233, ll. 22-4, p. 234, ll. 19-20] (cf. : for the former ibn Wadhich, al Tabari [p. 189, ll. 25, 30] and al Baladhuri [p. 207, ll. 18-27], (695) the Roman defeat in the plain of Antioch (Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 470, ll. 13-4], *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* [p. 175, l. 36-p. 176, l. 2], cf. : *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* [p. 9, ll. 3-6], Elias of Nisibis [p. 73, ll. 24-5], ibn Wadhich [p. 189, ll. 26-9], al Tabari [p. 198, ll. 31-2]) not found in Theophanes but cited by Brooks in respect of the common tradition of the first two sources⁽³⁾, (698) 'Alid's invasion and Sergius' treacherous surrender of Lazica [AM 6189, I, p. 370, ll. 1-3, II, p. 235, ll. 29-30] to bring Arab domination (following the end of the earlier negotiated condominium over Armenia and Iberia) to the eastern coast of the Black Sea, all derived from the eastern source ; (697-8) the Arab conquest of Africa and its capital Carthage depended upon the Byzantine source in the context of the overthrow of Leontius by Tiberius III Apsimarus [AM 6190, I, p. 370, ll. 6-20, II, p. 235, l. 31-p. 236, l. 6] (cf. Nicephorus [p. 39, ll. 13-26]), but the eastern source furnished notices of (700) the Byzantine raid to Samosata in Syria (Theophanes [AM 6192, I, p. 371, ll. 27-30, II, p. 236, l. 34-p. 237, l. 2], Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 474, ll. 1-2], Elias of Nisibis [p. 74, l. 18], al Tabari [p. 190, ll. 18-9]), of (702) the Arab garrisoning of Mopsuestia (although Theophanes [AM 6193, I, p. 372, ll. 2-4, II, p. 237, ll. 4-5], the *Chronicon ad ... 846 pertinens* [p. 176, ll. 14-6], the *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cli, p. 231, ll. 23-6] differed in date and detail from Michael the Syrian (704-6) [XI, 17, II, p. 477, ll. 32-3, p. 478, ll. 19-21] and Elias of Nisibis

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 118 ; cf. A. A. VASILIEV, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

(2) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

(3) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

(702-3) [p. 75, ll. 2-6, 12-3] : cf. ibn Wadhich [p. 19, ll. 2-3] and al Baladhuri [p. 204, l. 36-p. 205, l. 1]), of (703-4) the atrocities accompanying Arab rule in Armenia (Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 474, ll. 9-13], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxviii, p. 228, l. 24-p. 229, l. 7]) following the province's surrender to the Arabs and contributing to its revolt the following year (Theophanes [AM 6194-5, I, p. 372, ll. 6-7, 13-8, II, p. 237, ll. 7, 12-7]. cf. ibn al Athir [p. 190, ll. 32-6]) which was met by Arab invasion (*Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [CL, p. 231, ll. 26-30], Elias of Nisibis [p. 75, ll. 36-7], ibn al Athir [p. 191, ll. 13-4]); although Brooks used the conclusion of Theophanes' notices of (704-5) successive Byzantine repulses of Arab invasions of Cilicia [AM 6195-6, I, 372, ll. 18-26, II, p. 237, ll. 17-24] to supplement those of al Tabari [p. 191, ll. 25-8] (1), that of (709-10) the Arab seige and capture of Tyana was sui generis (Theophanes [AM 6201, I, p. 376, l. 37-p. 377, l. 15, II, p. 240, l. 26-p. 241, l. 5], cf. Nicephorus [p. 43, l. 19-p. 44, l. 13] from the Byzantine source and with the additional information of the penetration of a marauding Arab detachment as far as Chrysopolis, cf. Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 478, ll. 24-9], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [CLIII, p. 232, ll. 27-34], Agapius [p. 238, l. 18-p. 239, l. 3], al Tabari [p. 191, ll. 28-36, p. 192, ll. 2-18], al Baladhuri [p. 203, ll. 20-8]), while (710-11) the fortresses taken during subsequent Arab incursions into Cilicia (Theophanes [AM 6202-3, I, p. 377, ll. 16-23, II, p. 241, ll. 7-9], Michael the Syrian [XI, 17, II, p. 479, ll. 2-4], cf. *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* [p. 10, ll. 11-6], Elias of Nisibis [p. 76, l. 13], ibn Wadhich and al Tabari [p. 193, ll. 8-9, 12-5] showed tenuous correspondence in narrative and uncertain identification in toponymic.

(54) (689-90) 'Abd-al-Malik's difficulties in securing recognition from the whole Arab world (Theophanes [AM 6178, 6180, 6181, 6182, I, p. 363, ll. 21-6, p. 364, ll. 19-32, p. 364, l. 29-p. 365, l. 3, p. 365, ll. 5-6, II, p. 230, ll. 11-31, p. 231, ll. 27-34], cf. Michael the Syrian [XI, 15, II, p. 469, l. 32-p. 470, l. 3] briefly, *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxvii, p. 227, l. 31-p. 228, l. 28] and *Continuatio Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana* [p. 347, I, ll. 6-13, p. 347, I, l. 18-p. 348, I, l. 11, p. 347, II, ll. 25-33] sui generis) with even less congruence of style or content in narratives of (700-1) the short-lived revolt of 'Abd-rahman of Sijistan against the Umayyad viceroy of Persia and Iraq (Theophanes [AM 6191-2, I, p. 371, ll. 19-26, II, p. 236, ll. 31-3], cf. : Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 474, ll. 7-9; XI, 17, II, p. 478, ll. 1-2]) while Hitti implicitly rejected Theophanes' dating for Michael the Syrian's (704) (2); in Theophanes' notice (691) [AM 6183, I, p. 365, ll. 21-8, II, p. 232, ll. 18-24] the location of the mosque built by 'Abd-

(1) E. W. Brooks, *The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-750) from Arabic Sources* (v. *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, VIII (1898), pp. 182-208).

(2) P. K. Hitti, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

al-Malik may be amended from Mecca (found in no Syriac source) to that of the Dome of the Rock built on the site of 'Umar's earlier edifice at Jerusalem, and Sergius son of Mansur may be identified with Sarjun ibn Mancour of Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 477, ll. 16-7] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cxxxxix, p. 230, ll. 7-16] (recté Sarjūn ibn-Mansūr, son of Mansūr ibn-Sajūn prominent in the treacherous surrender of Damascus to Khālīd, father of St John (Yōhanna) the Damascene, in youth a financial office of the Ymayyad Caliphate, a family history which illustrated the participation of Syrian Christians in Arab government); while Brooks, to establish and to identify the common source underlying the *Chronographia*, the *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens*, the *Chronicle* (1), also cited 'Abd-al-Malik's edict for the extermination of pigs (Theophanes (695) [AM 6186, I, p. 367, l. 13 (omitted by Anastasius)], Michael the Syrian undated [XI, 16, II, p. 457, I, ll. 3-5], *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* (704) [p. 176, l. 18], and additionally in the *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* (704) [p. 9, l. 25], *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cl, p. 230, ll. 26-7]), (697) the minting of an Arab coinage marked only with inscriptions (Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 473, ll. 20-1], *Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* [p. 176, ll. 8-9]) although Brooks was unaware of Elias of Nisibis' notice [p. 75, ll. 28-30] which according to Hitti (2) correctly dated this (695) (cf. : *Chronicon ad 819 pertinens* (697) [p. 9, ll. 10-11] and *Chronicon ... ad 1234 pertinens* [cf. p. 230, ll. 19-25] for undated description of inscriptions); (705) saw the accession of Walid I on the death of 'Abd-al-Malik (Theophanes [AM 6197, I, p. 374, ll. 4-5, II, p. 238, ll. 27-8]) at Mopsuestia (Michael the Syrian [XI, 17, II, p. 478, ll. 21-2], cf. Agapius [p. 238, ll. 10-2], Elias of Nisibis [p. 75, ll. 24-5] briefly and not altogether accurately), who (708) built the great Umayyad mosque at Damascus and ordered that in compilation of the Caliphate's public registers Greek should be replaced by Arabic (Theophanes [AM 6199, I, p. 375, l. 31-p. 376, l. 6, II, p. 240, ll. 1-8]; cf. : Agapius [p. 238, ll. 13-7], Elias of Nisibis [p. 75, ll. 35-7], Michael the Syrian [XI, 17, II, p. 481, I, ll. 25-30, 20-5] the former undated and the latter (711), and the *Chronicon... ad 1234 pertinens* (707, 709) [cliii, p. 232, ll. 22-6, p. 233, ll. 1-4]); the occasional unpredictability of chronological indications for the reign of Constans II and of Justinian II in Michael the Syrian contrasted with the narrative of Theophanes.

(55) (688) a great famine in Syria forcing mass-migrations to imperial territory (Theophanes alone [AM 6179, I, p. 364, ll. 2-4, II, p. 231, ll. 9-10]) in possible part-duplication of the notice of 685 [AM 6176, I, p. 361, l. 7, II, p. 228, ll. 29-30], (Oct. 695) an eclipse of the sun (Theophanes [AM 6168, I, p. 367, ll. 8-9, II, p. 233, ll. 21-

(1) E. W. BROOKS, *op. cit.*

(2) P. K. HITTI, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

3]; cf. Michael the Syrian [XI, 16, II, p. 474, II, ll. 21-6] dated (Oct. 694), Elias of Nisibis [p. 73, ll. 16-8, 25-6] separate phenomena (May, Oct. 693, May, 694) of divergent dating correctly fixed by Byzantine numismatic evidence (Oct. 693), (701) a great plague of unspecified location (Theophanes [AM 6192, I, p. 371, l. 23 (omitted by Anastasius)] or of bubonic character and in Syria (Elias of Nisibis [p. 74, ll. 16-7]) possibly that (705) which was of such great magnitude that the dead could not be buried by the living (Denis of Tellmahré [p. 10, ll. 25-7]) or (705) so devastating that a third of the human race disappeared from the face of the earth (Michael the Syrian [XI, 17, II, p. 480, I, ll. 1-4]) — precision in identification was impossible especially when the localised catastrophe almost inevitably went unremarked by the Constantinopolitan chronicle just as (698) the plague raging in the capital at Leontius' overthrow (Theophanes [AM 6190, I, p. 371, ll. 4-5, II, p. 236, ll. 20-1], Nicephorus [p. 40, l. 12]) went unnoted in the eastern sources, (706) a violent earthquake (unlisted by Grumel) ⁽¹⁾ and an unprecedented April frost (Michael the Syrian [XI, 17, II, p. 480, I, ll. 5-11] the sole recorder).

The attribution of a multiplicity of sources to a vanished tradition imprecisely depicted was regrettable but inevitable in the treatment of a notoriously ill-documented epoch, and the attribution of that tradition to Syria was acceptable in the light of the province's transmission of its Graeco-Aramaic culture to Byzantium's so-called Umayyad "successor- state" ⁽²⁾.

The brief literary renaissance of the reign of Heraclius was made more striking by the complete absence of historiographical activity during the reigns of his successors, an aridity which was thrown into high relief by the unexpected conclusion that the narrative of the two contemporary Byzantine chronicle sources written in Constantinople in mid-seventh century coincidentally terminated in or just after 641, for the next Byzantine historical source of which we have any direct information was the *Chronicon Syntomon* of the most Christian and orthodox patrician Trajan who according to the Suda lived at the time of Justinian Rhinotmetus and whose work comprised a history of the seventh century (re vera, from 668) based first upon oral and then upon eyewitness testimony which extended to the deposition of Philip Bardanes

(1) V. GRUMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

(2) H. A. R. GIBB, *Arab-Byzantine Relations under the Umayyad Caliphate* (v. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XII (1958), pp. 219-233).

by Anastasius II Artemius in 713 ⁽¹⁾, an authority which has survived only in so far as it was laid under levy by later chroniclers. Since for the reigns of Constantine IV Pogonatus ⁽⁵⁶⁾ and Justinian II Rhinotmetus the Byzantine chronicle that was Theophanes' second and Nicephorus' sole source was held in common although often altered considerably in reproduction according to the aims and interest of the individual chroniclers, and also appeared in George the Monk where by reason of the brevity of the narrative it remained uncertain whether this was an independent derivation or on the analogy of the *Chronicle* for the greater part of the seventh century a mediate derivation via Theophanes, and was later indirectly transmitted to Leo Grammaticus and George Cedrenus, an identification of this source with Trajan's lost *Chronicle* would seem permissible and indeed probable :

(56) A surname bestowed by George the Monk [p. 727, l. 12] ; Brooks disregarded the testimony of the twelfth century Constantine Manasses and the thirteenth century Joel that the title was awarded to Constantine because he left Constantinople for Sicily cleanshaven to avenge his father's murder (668) but returned from Syracuse with a long beard, in favour of the testimony of Byzantine coinage attributing the surname instead to Constans II who apparently favoured a particularly long and luxuriant beard, on the grounds of the inaccuracy of the major historical premise and the absence of the title from Theophanes who used George the Monk's source, suggesting that it was an interpolation into the manuscript tradition of George the Monk ^(*) ; Grierson queried the uniqueness of Constans II's beard while admitting the confusion of the *Catalogus Sepulchrorum* posthumously appended to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De Ceremoniis* concerning the middle Heraclians ^(*) ; but although there is evidence of the earlier attribution of the surname Pogonatus to Constantine IV in ecclesiastical sources for the *Acathestus* office placed the seven year siege of Constantinople by the Arabs in the reign of Constantine Pogonatus [col. 1346, ll. 22-33], yet the recording of the death in Sicily of pope Martin I's persecutor Constans Pogonatus [p. 253, l. 33] in the eighth century Greek *Vita* confirmed Brooks' historical judgement ; but his rejection of Patzig's formulation of a source (685-95) for that group of tenth century writers which

(1) *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, II vols. Leipzig, 1928-1929.

(2) E. W. Brooks, *Who was Constantine Pogonatus?* (*v. Byz. Zeitschr.*, XVII (1908), pp. 460-462).

(3) P. GRIERSON, *op. cit.*

included the interpolator of George the Monk ⁽¹⁾ prevented recognition that the source of the anecdote was represented (for instance) in Leo Grammaticus [p. 159, ll. 12-4].

The interests of this source were clearly defined if limited, and Theophanes took from it for the reign of Constantine IV one element of his account of the relations of Constantine IV and his brothers (57) in addition to the notices of the Arab assault upon Constantinople (58), of the sixth oecumenical council of Constantinople (59), and the account of the origin and racial history of the Onogur-Bulgars (60) inserted into the reign of Constantine IV as a prelude to that emperor's campaigns (61), but the identification of the common source chronicle of Theophanes and Nicephorus raised the further question of whether its transmission was through direct derivation or through the mediation of another source :

(57) (668) their brief joint rule [AM 6160, I, p. 352, ll. 7-9, II, p. 222, ll. 12-4] terminated (669) by their mutilation after the revolt of the Anatolic theme [AM 6161, I, p. 352, ll. 12-24, II, p. 222, ll. 16-20] and ultimately (681) their deposition [AM 6173, I, p. 360, ll. 18-20, II, p. 228, ll. 13-6] ; a component in a composite chronicle of events already considered.

(58) In the seven year (reckoning from the capture of Cyzicus (670) ⁽²⁾), siege when annual naval attacks were repulsed by Constantine IV's use of Greek fire (the chroniclers elaborating neither the recently acquired maritime mastery of the Arabs ⁽³⁾ nor the chemical achievement of the Byzantines ⁽⁴⁾) until heavy losses from battle casualties and disease forced the lifting of the siege and the evacuation of Cyzicus (677) (Theophanes [AM 6162, 6164, 6165, I, p. 353, ll. 6-7, p. 353, ll. 14-25, p. 353, l. 25-p. 354, l. 8, II, p. 222, ll. 27-8, p. 223, ll. 4-24], Nicephorus [p. 32, I, 5-p. 33, l. 12], George the Monk [p. 727, l. 16-p. 728, l. 5]) and a severe defeat of the Arab army in Asia Minor in the same year (Theophanes [AM 6165, I, p. 354, ll. 8-13, II, p. 223, ll. 24-9] from the Syriac chronicle source) compelled Mu'āwiyah to sue for peace (Theophanes [AM 6169, I, p. 355, l. 10-

(1) G. PATZIG, *Johannes Antiocheus und Malalas*, Leipzig, 1892, *passim*.

(2) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 111, following E. Gibbon.

(3) P. KAHLE, *Zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Alexandria* (v. *Der Islam*, XII (1922), pp. 29-83). M. CANARD, *Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople* (v. *Journ. Asiat.*, CVIII (1926), pp. 61-121).

(4) G. ZENGHELIS, *Le Feu grégeois* (v. *Byzantion*, VII (1932), pp. 265-286).

p. 356, l. 2, II, p. 224, ll. 6-26] from a source inaccessible to Nicephorus and not reproduced by George the Monk).

(59) (Nov. 680-Sept. 681) reversing in cooperation with Rome the then irrelevant imperial Monotheletism (Theophanes [AM 6171-2, I, p. 359, l. 26-p. 360, l. 12, II, p. 227, l. 28-p. 228, l. 11]) the second notice repeating in shorter form the information of the first, justifiable in strict accordance with the chronological canon or explicable as a duplicate entry from the eastern world chronicle but in either instance suggesting an inadequacy of historical information which led Theophanes to repetition in order to maintain an annalistic format without a blank year; Nicephorus' account from the common source was briefer [p. 35, l. 27-p. 36, l. 7] but George the Monk's narrative was not only more detailed than those of Theophanes and Nicephorus but also markedly divergent from them [p. 725, l. 14-p. 727, l. 15], reflecting possibly a synodicon of the same form as the later *Synodicon Vetus* ⁽¹⁾, the type of source to which he would almost certainly have had access, and manifesting a peculiar and perplexing similarity to Michael the Syrian [XI, 12, II, p. 452, II, ll. 3-20]); the denial of the novelty of the council's doctrine (Theophanes [AM 6177, I, p. 361, l. 18-p. 363, l. 20, II, p. 229, l. 3-p. 230, l. 10]) with its confused allusion to the official promulgation (Jan. 706) of the decrees of the Quinisextum council (691-2) (otherwise unmentioned in the *Chronographia* which extended this silence to the relations of Justinian II with popes Sergius and Constantine ⁽²⁾), and the detailed imperial and patriarchal chronology was, from the conclusion of the latter with John Lecanonates (John VII Morcharizanus Grammaticus, d. March 843) a later interpolation into Theophanes.

(60) Theophanes [AM 6171, I, p. 356, l. 17-p. 358, l. 5, II, p. 225, l. 10-p. 226, l. 22], with Nicephorus' account corresponding almost completely if with a less detailed description of the Bulgar homeland and variations in the spelling of names [p. 33, l. 13-p. 34, l. 12], while George the Monk excerpted only the brief statement of the invasion of Thrace by the Bulgars from lake Maiotis on the northern shores of the Euxine [p. 728, ll. 15-9]; Moravcsik has constructed a brief summary of the complicated early racial history of the Bulgarian and Hungarian peoples from Byzantine sources ⁽³⁾, and Beševliev has published minor variant readings of de Boor's edition of the

(1) Vd.: Io. Alb. Fabricii ... *Bibliotheca Graeca*, ed. G. C. Harles, 4th ed. Hamburg-Leipzig, 1790-1809, vol. XII.

(2) F. GÖRRES, *Justinian II und das römische Papsttum* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XVII (1908), pp. 440-450).

(3) G. MORAVCSIK, *Zur Geschichte der Onoguren* (v. *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, X (1930), pp. 70-91).

Chronographia concerning the emergence of the Onogur-Bulgars⁽¹⁾ irrelevant in this context.

(61) After the disintegration of Koubrat's realm of Great Bulgaria in mid-seventh century under Khazar pressures led to the westward movement of the Bulgar hordes under Asparuch from the steppes bordering the sea of Azov to the mouth of the Danube; Constantine IV's unsuccessful offensive (679/80, a date not corresponding to Theophanes AM 6171 = 678/9)⁽²⁾ in fact facilitated the establishment of a Slav-Bulgar kingdom on Byzantine soil between the Danube and the Balkan Mts. (summer 681)⁽³⁾ [AM 6171, I, p. 358, l. 8-p. 359, l. 9, II, p. 226, l. 22-p. 227, l. 23] (cf.: Nicephorus [p. 34, l. 21-p. 35, l. 24] with less detail but substantial correspondence in style and content, and George the Monk [p. 726, ll. 1-6] abbreviated from Theophanes), so that Constantine IV was forced to make a treaty and pay annual tribute (Nicephorus [p. 35, ll. 24-5]) which was a cause for wonder and shame (Theophanes [AM 6171, I, p. 359, ll. 19-25, II, p. 227, ll. 24-7]) to an Empire as yet unused to a permanent defensive position⁽⁴⁾, while the Bulgars gradually became assimilated to their Slav tributaries⁽⁵⁾.

The latter was probably the case, since Theophanes and Nicephorus also shared a common source for the history of the eighth century so that the assumption of their independent utilisation of two separate and consecutive common sources would appear highly coincidental even granted the poor state of contemporary Byzantine chronography. Furthermore Beševliev's attribution of Nicephorus' presentation of the relations between Heraclius and the Bulgar chiefs Organas and Kouvrat together with John of Nikiu's account of the rôle of the latter in the reigns of Constantine III and Heraclonas as well as Theophanes' and Nicephorus' narratives of the origin of the Bulgar kingdom, to the same contemporary Bulgar narrative source which incorporated earlier oral tradition and was inserted into Byzantine chronography in the mid-eighth century by the reporter of the Bulgar campaigns of Constantine V Copronymus in 763 and 773⁽⁶⁾ (Theophanes [AM 6254,

(1) V. BEŠEVLIEV, *Zur Chronographie des Theophanes* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXVII (1927), p. 35).

(2) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 113, n. 2.

(3) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 113, n. 5.

(4) L. BRÉHIER, *op. cit.*

(5) A. A. VASILIEV, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-220.

(6) V. BEŠEVLIEV, *Kurios Bulgarias bei Theophanes* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLI (1941), pp. 289-298).

6265, I, p. 432, l. 25-p. 433, l. 2, p. 446, l. 27-p. 447, l. 26, II, p. 284, l. 17-p. 285, l. 9, p. 295, l. 23-p. 296, l. 17], Nicephorus [p. 69, l. 13-p. 70, l. 10, p. 73, ll. 10-29]), had two consequences : — the existence as a distinct entity of this Bulgar source was reinforced by its independent appearance in John of Nikiu, while over the total Theophanes / Nicephorus tradition there was entailed a similarity in style and language most easily explicable by the transcription of both earlier works by the author of the later common source at the end of the eighth century, and thus the integration of the Bulgar source into Trajan's text as prelude to the incorporation or conscious continuation of Trajan in the later work rather than the preservation of the two chroniclers in proximity in the same manuscript codex. No further filiations of this Bulgar tradition have been considered, although it would be tempting to take the argument one stage further and to postulate an additional relationship to the anonymous and immediately contemporary *Diegesis* ⁽¹⁾ on the disastrous Bulgar campaign of Nicephorus I in 811, which was laid under levy by Theophanes (if with extensive and not always successful abbreviations), and which together with a detailed anonymous study of the reign of Leo V the Armenian (813-20) ⁽²⁾ has been convincingly argued to constitute fragments of a vulgar chronicle now lost in the style and type of Malalas, a continuation which in its earlier narrative received a polished recension by the elusive John of Antioch ⁽³⁾. Although the narratives of John of Antioch's *Historia* and Theophanes' *Chronographia* for the first decade of the seventh century were not totally divorced, such a structured tradition although attractive must remain speculative. Given the longstanding recognition that there were only two major sources in Byzantine chronography for the Heraclian era (i) the so-called *Epitome* begun in the seventh and early eighth centuries with Trajan as its probable nucleus and continued to 842 ⁽⁴⁾ now

(1) H. GRÉGOIRE, *Un nouveau fragment du 'Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio'* (v. *Byzantion*, XI (1936), pp. 417-427).

(2) Vd. *Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio*, ed. I. Bekker, in *Leonis grammatici Chronographia*, Bonn, 1842, pp. 335-362.

(3) H. GRÉGOIRE, *Du nouveau sur la chronographie byzantine : le 'Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio' est le dernier continuateur de Malalas* (v. *Bulletin de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, XXI (1936), pp. 420-436).

(4) G. PATZIG, *op. cit.*

recognised as the source of Leo Grammaticus and those tenth century chroniclers (62) (viz. Theodosius of Melitene, the anonymous Georgius Monachos Continuatus, Symeon Magister and Logothete or so-called Pseudo-Symeon) once thought to be related to him (1), and (ii) the chronicle revealed by comparison of the concurrent narratives of *Chronographia*, *Breviarium* and *Antirrhetici* III for the plague of 747 to have been composed after the death of Constantine V by an iconophile monk to form the common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus for the reigns of Leo III and Constantine V (717-52) (2), given the continuing connection from Nicephorus' Bulgar narrative for the first half of the seventh to the second half of the eighth century, the common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus for the eighth century was the Constantinopolitan vignette of imperial and ecclesiastical history comprised in Nicephorus' earlier authority of the fragmentary *Megas Chronographos* (3):

(62) Redaction A of the *Epitome* was represented by Theodosius of Melitene, Symeon Magister or Pseudo-Symeon, Georgius Monachos Continuatus, all identified as copyists, abbreviators or revisors of the *Chronicle* of Symeon Logothetes best known in an Old Slavonic version as the complete Greek text was as yet unpublished (4), while redaction B of the *Epitome* was represented by Leo Grammaticus and either directly or through the mediation of Leo Grammaticus provided for the period under consideration one of the principal sources for George Cedrenus, together with the Pseudo-Symeon derivative of Theophanes and George the Monk (5), in addition to the *Historical Survey* of John Scylitzes. No attempt to elucidate the extremely complicated internal relationship of this group of sources has been made in the present paper, where they were cited only in comparison with Theophanes' distinctive tradition. The unoriginal notices and haphazard borrowings from George the Monk, Leo Grammaticus, Georgius Monachos Continuatus and George

(1) G. PATZIG, *Leo Grammaticus und seine Sippe* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, III (1894), pp. 470-497).

(2) P. J. ALEXANDER, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Oxford, 1958, pp. 153-162.

(3) G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, Berlin, 1958, I, pp. 457, 532.

(4) G. OSTROGORSKY, *L'expédition du Prince Oleg contre Constantinople en 907* (v. *Annales de l'Institut Kondakov*, XI (1940), pp. 47-62).

(5) K. PRAECHTER, *Quellenkritische Studien zu Kedrenos (cod. Paris. gr., 1712)*, (v. *Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Kl.*, II, 1 (1897), pp. 1-107).

Cedrenus, rendered the alleged *Chronographikon Syntomon* of St Cyril of Alexandria and George of Pisidia ⁽¹⁾ a virtually worthless and as yet unpublished compilation preserved in an assortment of Latin and Greek versions whose precise source-traditions and actual authorship were unascertainable ⁽²⁾.

Theophanes' chief source and Nicephorus' only source for the reign of Justinian II and the intervening reigns of Leontius (695-8) and Tiberius III Apsimarus (698-705) was the non-extant Byzantine chronicle tradition which has been identified with the *Chronicon Syntomon* of the patrician Trajan and which provided an exposition of events in Constantinople with especial reference to the violent upheavals of the imperial throne (63), of the Empire in its external relations with the Bulgars and Slavs (64), and a selective account of Byzantino-Arab relations (65) :

(63) After Justinian's accession (Sept. 685) (Theophanes [AM 6177-8, I, p. 361, ll. 15-6, p. 363, ll. 26-7, II, p. 229, ll. 3-5, p. 231, ll. 1-2], cf. Nicephorus [p. 36, ll. 12-3] and George the Monk [p. 729, ll. 18-9] both with less detail) there was no mention of his domestic policy before Theophanes' notice (694) of his building activities completing the Great Palace and linking it to that of Daphne and to the Hippodrome ⁽³⁾, or of the erection of a monument to the Blues necessitating the demolition and rebuilding of a church dedicated to the Virgin, and of the appointment and brutal extortions of Stephen as imperial sacellarius and Theodotus as logothete of the treasury (Theophanes [AM 6186, I, p. 367, l. 12-p. 368, l. 11, II, p. 233, l. 24-p. 234, l. 19], cf. Nicephorus [p. 37, ll. 11-23] without reference to buildings, George the Monk [p. 731, ll. 2-17] with the Blues' monument alone) ; (695) to avert the slaughter of the entire population of the capital Leontius, freshly appointed strategus of the newly created theme of Hellas ⁽⁴⁾, led a popular rising which culminated in the mutilation and exile of Justinian with the burning of his hated ministers and Leontius' own proclamation (Theophanes [AM 6187, I, p. 368, l. 15-p. 369, l. 30, II, p. 234, l. 20-p. 235, l. 25], cf. : Nicephorus [p. 37, l. 24-p. 39, l. 21] lacking Justinian's projected slaughter of the people but adding that Justinian's life was spared for his kindness to Leontius' father), a sequence of events within which George the Monk's insertion of the rôle of the Blues [p. 731,

(1) Vd. Io. Alb. Fabricii ... *Bibliotheca Graeca*, ed. G. G. Harles, 4th ed. Hamburg-Leipzig, 1790-1807, VII.

(2) A. WIRTH, *Chronographische Späne*, Frankfurt 1894, p. 57 ff.

(3) J. B. BURY, *The Great Palace* (v. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXI (1912), pp. 219-231).

(4) A. PERTUSI, *op. cit.*

ll. 17-20] (despite lack of evidence and their voluntary or involuntary inactivity under Heraclius ⁽¹⁾, the continued importance of the demes as a factor in Byzantine politics up to the start of the ninth century has been established) ⁽²⁾ raised the question of derivation since it was found nowhere in the Theophanes/Nicephorus common source (indeed AM 6186 would suggest Justinian's favour of the same faction) and only Michael the Syrian with no source link with George the Monk noted the revolt of a united aristocracy in self-preservation against Justinian's enmity [XI, 16, II, p. 473, ll. 8-15]; (698) the overthrow, mutilation and imprisonment of Leontius by Apsimar the drungarius of the Cibyrraeot theme followed by the Byzantine expulsion from North Africa (Theophanes [AM 6190, I, p. 370, l. 18-p. 371, l. 9, II, p. 236, ll. 6-25], cf. Nicephorus [p. 39, l. 26-p. 40, l. 16] and George the Monk [p. 731, l. 23-p. 732, l. 18], the former slightly and the latter markedly less detailed than Theophanes); we have information of only two of Apsimar's actions as emperor viz. (699) the appointment of his brother Heraclius to command in Cappadocia and (704) the banishment of Philip Bardanes to Cephallonia, provided by Theophanes alone [AM 6190, I, p. 371, ll. 9-13, II, p. 236, ll. 25-9; AM 6194, I, p. 372, ll. 7-11, II, p. 237, ll. 6-11], while the main emphasis of the narrative was upon (704) Justinian II's exile at Cherson, his flight to Daras where he made alliance with the Khazar khan and married his daughter, and his further flight in the face of treachery across the Euxine to the mouth of the Danube and alliance with the Bulgar Tervel with whom he returned to Constantinople (autumn 705) (Theophanes [AM 6196-7, I, p. 372, l. 26-p. 374, l. 23, II, p. 237, l. 21-p. 238, l. 36], cf. : Nicephorus [p. 40, l. 17-p. 42, l. 5] with less detail anent Justinian II's departure from Phanaguria and journey across the Euxine, and George the Monk [p. 732, ll. 13-8] in outline only); (705) having rewarded Tervel and taken vengeance upon Apsimar and Leontius, Heraclius and the patriarch Callinicus, Justinian embarked upon a systematic reign of terror, and having summoned from Khazaria his wife Theodora and his son Tiberius he crowned the latter as co-emperor (706) (Theophanes [AM 6198, I, p. 375, ll. 1-28, II, p. 239, ll. 5-35], cf. : Nicephorus [p. 42, l. 20-p. 43, l. 9] with more detail of the honours bestowed upon Tervel and the reason for Justinian's enmity towards Callinicus but with less anent the journey of Theodora from Khazaria, George the Monk [p. 732, l. 20-p. 733, l. 10] a brief survey of Justinian's vengeance upon Apsimar, Callinicus, the people of the Capital); (710-11) Justinian dispatched three punitive expeditions against Cherson

(1) F. DVORNIK, *The Circus Parties in Byzantium* (v. *Byzantina-Metabyzantina*, I (1946), pp. 5-10).

(2) A. MARICQ, *La durée du régime des partis populaires à Constantinople* (*Bulletin de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, XXV (1949), pp. 63-74).

which were to cost him both his throne and his life, for the city under the inspiration of Philip Bardanes (previously driven from Cephalonia) was compelled to make alliance with the Khazar khan and then to proclaim Bardanes, so that Justinian's final expedition made common cause with Cherson while first the people of the capital and then the assembled troops of the Thracian and Opsikion themes abandoned Justinian who was beheaded at Damatrys, and his young son at Constantinople (Theophanes [AM 6203, I, p. 377, l. 2-p. 381, l. 6, II, p. 241, l. 12-p. 244, l. 8], cf. : Nicephorus [p. 44, l. 13-p. 48, l. 7] with only minor stylistic variations and differences in the spelling of proper names, but with additional information of the renewal of the alliance of Justinian and Tervel (711), and George the Monk [p. 733, ll. 14-22] with a concise account abridged from Theophanes).

(64) (688-9) ⁽¹⁾ saw Justinian's penetration into the Slav occupied Balkans as far as Thessalonica with ensuing settlement of Slav stratiotai around Abydus and in Bithynia (Theophanes [AM 6180, I, p. 364, ll. 11-15, II, p. 231, ll. 16-23], cf. : Nicephorus [p. 36, ll. 16-22] closely corresponding, but George the Monk [p. 729, ll. 19-21] with a brief note) and the rôle of Slav military levies in Byzantino-Arab engagements (693, 694-5) [AM 6184, 6186-7, I, p. 366, ll. 6-23, p. 367, ll. 9-12, p. 368, ll. 13-4, II, p. 232, l. 31-p. 233, l. 10, p. 233, ll. 22-4, p. 234, ll. 19-20] has already been noted, but Justinian's policy of colonisation with regard to the Slavs and to other races was more successful and more permanent ⁽²⁾ than Theophanes' prejudice ⁽³⁾ would allow; the rôle of the Bulgars in Justinian's restoration to (705) and vain defence of (711) the imperial throne [AM 6197, I, p. 373, l. 15-p. 374, l. 8, ll. 16-23, II, p. 238, ll. 8-20, 24-9] has been noted above, and Ostrogorsky has used the latter episode to cast doubt upon the reliability of Theophanes' detailed notice (708) of Justinian's naval and military offensive which ended in defeat at Anchialus in Thrace [AM 6200, I, p. 376, ll. 13-29, II, p. 240, ll. 9-25] (cf. : Nicephorus [p. 43, ll. 9-19] closely corresponding) ⁽⁴⁾, but this doubt was insufficiently substantiated in view of the usual accuracy of the common source in this respect, and in the light of previous Byzantino-Bulgar relations it was not inconceivable that Tervel, who in spite of the Sclavinia campaign (688-9) which broke the peace negotiated between Constantine IV and the Bulgars had been

(1) G. OSTROGORSKY, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, p. 117, n. 1.

(2) A. MARICQ, *Notes sur les Slaves dans le Péloponnèse et en Bithynie* (v. *Byzantion*, XXII (1952), pp. 350-361).

(3) P. CHARANIS, *The Slavic element in Byzantine Asia Minor* (v. *Byzantion*, XVIII (1948), pp. 70-74).

(4) G. OSTROGORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 126, n. 2.

induced to support Justinian II (705) should have done so again (711) despite intervening aggression if sufficient incentive was offered.

(65) Which in respect of Theophanes' narrative proved impossible to disentangle coherently from that provided by the Greek Syriac source treated in detail above, so that the narrative of the Byzantine source must be reconstructed from Nicephorus; it comprised Justinian's defeat at Sebastopolis (the modern Sulu-saray) in Armenia (692) [p. 36, l. 30-p. 37, l. 5], the Arab conquest of Byzantine North Africa (697-8) [p. 39, ll. 12-36] (without recognition of the superficiality of the imperial reconquest in the sixth century and of the consequent erosion of the Roman ethos before the Arab advent ⁽¹⁾), the Arab conquest of Tyana (709-10) [p. 43, l. 9-p. 44, l. 6] and penetration (710-11) through Cilicia and to Chrysopolis [p. 44, ll. 6-13], but without comment on Justinian's concentration on personal vendettas which made the Arab advance possible; the topic was largely ignored by George the Monk.

Trajan's *Chronographikon Syntomon* linked the otherwise diverse traditions of Theophanes and Nicephorus with those of the *Epitome*-chroniclers represented by Leo Grammaticus (66) and George Cedrenus (67), and study of the sources in which it was reproduced allowed some measure of conjecture upon the time and the circumstances of Trajan's composition for its original form may be discerned, not so much in the indirect tradition of the tenth century and later chroniclers or in the *Chronographia* where it was fragmented by an annalistic framework and combined with another source as in the *Breviarium*, where despite Nicephorus' abbreviations and occasional omissions it was the sole source so that the primitive *Breviarium* of the London codex was probably the most nearly identical with the original *Chronographikon Syntomon*:

(66) But study of Trajan's legacy to Leo Grammaticus as representative of those chronicles derived from Symeon Logothetes was not especially informative, in that Leo Grammaticus' version of those events of the reign of Constantine IV ultimately dependent upon Trajan as source was generally brief viz.: the notice of the Arab siege of Constantinople [p. 159, l. 18-p. 160, l. 5] and the consequent thirty year peace [p. 160, ll. 12-22] (supplemented by Theophanes' information anent Callinicus and Greek fire [p. 160, ll. 5-10]), Mardiate occupation of Lebanon [p. 160, ll. 11-12], 'Abd-al-Malik's renewal of the peace [p. 162, ll. 9-14]), the universal peace which

(1) W. H. C. FRENCH, *The End of Roman North Africa* (v. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, V (1955), p. 73).

prompted Constantine to launch his disastrous Bulgar campaign [p. 160, 22-p. 161, 23], the council of Constantinople [p. 162, ll. 1-5], the death of Constantine IV and accession of Justinian II [p. 162, ll. 14-6] (supplemented from the *Epitome* in respect of the former's wife's burial with him (wrongly) and the latter's coronation [p. 162, ll. 5-9]), so that without study of related texts it might appear that Leo Grammaticus at least knew Trajan through the mediation of Theophanes for the two sources continued interwoven through Leo Grammaticus' chronicle for the reign of Justinian II; Trajan had recorded the further renewal of the Byzantino-Arab peace which Justinian broke after his Slav expedition so that his defeat at Sebastopolis was accompanied by the Slav desertion for which he exacted great vengeance [p. 162, l. 16-p. 164, l. 2], Theophanes had inserted notices anent Justinian's measures in Constantinople [p. 164, ll. 2-23] as preface to Trajan's account of Leontius' coup d'état (here Leo Grammaticus diverged from Theophanes and Nicephorus in detail in possible indication of independence) [p. 165, ll. 1-20] while to Trajan's record of the overthrow of Leontius by Apsimaros to inaugurate a seven year reign in which Bardanes was banished [p. 165, l. 22-p. 167, l. 8] Theophanes added the Roman invasion of Syria [p. 167, ll. 3-4], and the relatively brief presentation by Leo Grammaticus of Justinian's exile ended by restoration with Tervel's aid [p. 167, l. 8-p. 168, l. 16] and Justinian's consolidation of his position by massacre of his opponents and coronation of his son and war against the Bulgars [p. 168, l. 16-p. 169, l. 10] before the savage retribution visited upon Cherson led to his death at the hands of the usurping Philip Bardanes [p. 169, ll. 11-23] made definite source determination difficult.

(67) Again, George Cedrenus gave little illumination to Trajan for his chronicle of the reigns of Constantine IV and Justinian II was almost entirely derived from Theophanes; in respect of 'Mu' āwiyah's great offensive which culminated in the vain seven year siege of Constantinople (with some additional detail) whose failure was recognised by the thirty year peace [p. 764, ll. 7-8, p. 764, l. 19-p. 766, l. 10], but to Constantine IV's Bulgar hostilities [p. 766, ll. 11-5] was appended an unidentified reflection that defeat at their hands led the emperor to work for the peace of the Church [p. 770, ll. 3-19] by the condemnation of Monotheletism, and if the introduction of the council of Constantinople was reminiscent of Theophanes the remainder of George Cedrenus' narrative was so close to George the Monk so as to suggest (together with a history of local synods before the conversion of the Empire, of earlier oecumenical councils, of the Latrocinium) a similar synodical source [p. 766, l. 14-p. 770, l. 2], but notices of natural phenomena [p. 764, l. 16-8] were derived from Theophanes; the statement of Justinian II's accession [p. 770, ll. 22-3] was accompanied by original reflections upon his character [p. 771, ll. 1-3, 10-7], but George Cedrenus reproduced Theophanes'

chronicle (685-705) of the Caliphate's internal history and external expansion [p. 771, ll. 4-10, 18-9, p. 772, ll. 7-8, p. 772, l. 9-p. 773, l. 7, p. 773, l. 8-10, 11-14, p. 774, ll. 14-5, p. 776, ll. 9-11, p. 777, ll. 10-11, 12-25, p. 778, ll. 6-19], of Justinian's expedition against Slavs and Bulgars [p. 771, l. 23-p. 772, l. 6], of the natural phenomena of the last decade of the seventh century [p. 773, l. 11, p. 776, ll. 22-3, p. 777, l. 12], of the overthrow of Justinian by Leontius [p. 774, l. 15-p. 776, l. 8] with precise chronology and the overthrow of Leontius by Tiberius Apsimarus [p. 776, l. 20-p. 777, l. 10] during whose reign Bardanes was banished [p. 778, ll. 2-5], of Justinian's alliance with Tervel in his absence [p. 778, l. 9-p. 780, l. 6] and his descent upon Constantinople where after regaining his throne [p. 780, ll. 6-17] he slaughtered his enemies before crowning his Khazar wife and son [p. 780, l. 17-p. 781, l. 15], of his defeat after he had violated the peace with the Bulgars [p. 781, l. 16-p. 782, l. 3], of the vengeance wreaked upon the city of Cherson which cost Justinian his throne and his life [p. 782, l. 3-p. 784, l. 10], although George Cedrenus rendered in less detail than Theophanes this concluding tragedy of the Heraclians.

In its forty-five year span the relatively more detailed and wide-ranging treatment of the reign of Justinian II compared to that of Constantine IV would suggest a greater knowledge of and interest in events of which Trajan was a contemporary if not an eyewitness, while the prominence accorded to the Bulgars and to Justinian's exile at Cherson and Khazaria with little information concerning Constantinople during that decade in addition to the exposition of the systematic reign of terror in the capital and the pathological cruelty at Cherson which followed Justinian's restoration and led to his final downfall, all would suggest that Trajan was first a companion of Justinian during his exile and restoration with Bulgar aid but later a voluntary or involuntary exile for a second time in the Crimea whose marked hostility towards Justinian II was expressed in distorted accounts of his policies and atrocities and exaggerated numbers of the victims of his vengeance, a bias inevitably reflected in both the *Chronographia* and the *Breviarium* even although Nicephorus whose work was on the whole characterised by greater objectivity had sufficient critical sense to reject some of the more improbable of Justinian's alleged brutalities. But just as the chroniclers' portrayals of the reign of Justinian II require supplementation from other sources ⁽¹⁾, so in the absence

(1) C. DIEHL, *Choses et gens de Byzance*, Paris, 1926, pp. 174-211.

of historical evidence must Trajan's biography remain a matter of speculation and not of fact.

Research is merely the handmaid of history ; Pirenne emphasised that although in their absence history became fantasy, historical criticism and erudition were not the whole of history existing for their own sake but were solely the discoverers of facts, the authenticators of texts, the critics of sources, the establishers of chronology, and thereby fulfilled their essential but subordinate rôle of providing materials for what was properly called history, namely narrative history ⁽¹⁾ ; it was in this spirit, as a small contribution to this end, that this paper was written.

Bearsden (Scotland).

Ann S. PROUDFOOT.

(1) H. PIRENNE, *Une polémique historique en Allemagne* (v. *Rev. Hist.*, LXIV (1897), pp. 50-57).